

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

MARCH, 1907

NO.

First Impressions of Socialism Abroad.

No. 4. The Congress of the British Labor Party.

IT may seem curious to begin this chapter of my first impressions by some reminiscences of previous visits to Great Britain, but it is not absolutely untrue to my subject because, in the year 1899, when I lived for a while at Toynbee Hall in East London there was very little socialism to be impressed with. The socialists of London were very much discouraged and the movement seemed to be standing still. I remember penning at that time a letter to the editor of this review in which I told him that, so far as I could see, socialism was not taking root in England. Such sentiment as there was seemed to be middle-class, and I must confess that I wrote with considerable irritation against the "Gas and Water" propaganda which then was thought to be socialism. Later in the summer I attended the conference of the Social Democratic Federation at Manchester, but I did not change my conclusions. In fact it was not until I spent a few days with Keir Hardie at his home in Scotland that I began to think my estimate of the socialist movement was wrong. I arrived in the late afternoon, and as the night came on, Mr. and Mrs. Hardie took me for a walk. There was a beautiful full harvest moon and Hardie, after listening to my criticisms of the movement said, "Ah! but you have only seen London, and everyone that breathes the air of London loses hope. If you want to see the socialist movement, spend some time in the provinces and you will see that socialism is making tremen-

dous headway." He then went on to tell me of his own effort to organise the workers politically. He went fully into his plans and outlined to me at that time the lines upon which the movement would progress. It was a remarkable prophecy, and when I returned to England in 1903 I saw the movement had taken the form he had previously outlined, and that the Labor Party was becoming a substantial reality full of promise for the future. My wife and I went to see Hardie at his rooms in London. He lives in an old court reminiscent of bygone centuries, in the very garret of an old fourteenth century house. In this ancient and quaint old place he again spoke with enthusiasm of the rising socialist movement and prophesied then, that at the next election, at least twenty-seven labor men, a majority of them socialists, would be returned to parliament. It seemed a rash prophecy and most of the other socialists I met in London doubted that the Labor Party would develop such strength, but Hardie's prophecy was again true and as we now know, considerably more than that number were returned to parliament, and about thirty of them belong now to the Labor Party.

But it was not the propaganda of the socialists alone that brought into existence the Labor Party. It was to no small degree the result of an attack upon the very existence of the trade union movement. A decision of the courts, now known to history as the Taff Vale decision, threw the entire trade union movement into a state of excitement and dismay. The Taff Vale Railway Co. had sued the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants for having conspired to induce the workman of their company to break their contracts and also for having conspired to interfere with the traffic of the company by picketing and other alleged unlawful means. A prominent justice granted an injunction against the society and while this was later reversed by the Court of Appeal, the House of Lords finally sanctioned the decision as first rendered. It was decided that a trade union could be sued and as a result of the suit the Railway Union was forced to pay damages to the amount of about \$100,000. This decision was staggering, and the unions saw very clearly that unless something was done to alter the situation, the union movement would be destroyed. According to the English law, the decision practically amounted to new legislation against the unions, and a nullification of the old rights which had been won in 1871. Immediately there began a tremendous agitation among the unions to find some way of exerting their political power upon parliament so as to have a new law passed which would assure to unions the same rights which they had enjoyed under the law previous to the Taff Vale decision. By referring to the figures given later in this article it will be seen that the number of uni-

ons joining the Labor Party in the next two years increased from 41 to 127.

The party came into existence first under the form of the Labor Representation Committee of the Trade Union Congress. The idea at that time was that the committee should endeavor merely to get parliamentary representation for trade union men, but as the movement developed, it became a definite party and took the name of The Labor Party of Great Britain. In the short time of its existence it has grown to a membership of nearly one million. In other words, this enormous number of voters severed their connection finally with the two old parties, and the only candidates who could hope to obtain their support in the parliamentary election were those pledged to the principles and objects of the Labor Party. Their object, as defined in the constitution of the party, is to organise and maintain a parliamentary Labor Party with its own whips and policy, to secure the election of candidates for whose candidatures an affiliated society has made itself financially responsible, and who have been selected by the regularly convened conference in the constituency. Candidates and members must accept the constitution; agree to abide by the decisions of the parliamentary party in carrying out the aims of this constitution; appear before their constituencies under the title of Labor Candidates only; abstain strictly from identifying themselves with or promoting the interests of any party not eligible for affiliation; and they must not oppose any candidate recognised by the executive committee of the party. Candidates must also join the parliamentary Labor Party if elected." The party is a federation consisting of trade unions, trades councils, socialist societies, co-operative societies and local labor associations and all members elected under the auspices of the party are paid from a fund an equal sum not to exceed \$1000 per annum, but this payment is made only to those members whose candidatures have been promoted by societies which have contributed to the funds. Absolute independence of action from both the old parties is enforced upon those elected and absolute loyalty to the constitution and rules of the party is insisted upon.

The independence of the party should not be confused with what is known in Europe as neutrality. It is a definitely class party working to improve the conditions of life and work of the workers of Great Britain, and while sections of the tory or liberal party are not permitted to join the movement, the two socialist parties of Great Britain and the Fabian Socialist Society are welcomed. In fact both the Independent Labor Party (a socialist organization) and the Fabian Society are at present affiliated and members of these societies are put up as candidates of the

Labor Party. In other words, the party is independent politically of all parties except socialist parties. Indeed, although there has been every effort made by the capitalist papers and politicians to create a division between what they call the socialist section of the party and the trade union section, there is no real distinction, for most of the 17,000 affiliated socialists belong to trade unions and many of the affiliated trade unionists are also socialists. The strength of the socialists cannot, therefore, be measured by the number of adherents coming direct from the socialist groups. For instance, out of seven candidates successfully promoted and financed by the Independent Labor Party, three of them were trade union officials whose societies comprised about 50,000 members. At the same time, of the twenty-three candidates put up by the trade unions themselves, ten were leading members of the Independent Labor Party. Altogether thirteen members of parliament are both trade unionists and members of the Independent Labor Party, and they represent trade societies with a total of 330,000 members. Another striking fact which illustrates the identity of the two movements is illustrated in the fact that nearly all of the ablest militants are socialists. The chairman of the Parliamentary Committee, Mr. J. Keir Hardie, the chairman of the Executive Committee and the chairman of the Congress are all socialists and of the new Executive Committee only three are not socialists. In addition to these evidences of the socialist strength, a large majority of the candidates selected at present to contest new seats in the next general election are well known socialists. It is with this unity of purpose between the various movements of the working class that The Labor Party has carried on its electoral campaigns. The brilliant results of this combination are now known. At the first general election in which the party was engaged, twenty-nine members were elected to parliament, and a majority of them are socialists.

It was a great achievement, and when the news was cabled round the world it created untold amazement. The old political parties, the metropolitan newspapers, the leaders of thought, and the grave and wise governors of the destinies of the British people could not understand. No one seemed to know how such a movement could have arisen, could have attained such proportions without any of them knowing of its existence. British labor in politics! Fifteen or twenty socialists returned to the House of Commons! It seemed incredible. Of all the workers in the world none seemed less class-conscious, less imbued with socialist sentiment or revolutionary ideals than the British workingman. He had suffered every injustice. He lived in the most frightful conditions of squalor and poverty. When ac-

cident, old age or serious illness afflicted him, he and his family went to the workhouse or subsisted on the meager rations of outdoor relief, but heretofore there had been no complaint and such a political revolt seemed unbelievable. It had always been said that that "shocking and immortal thing" called socialism would never appeal to the Briton, and the governing classes, sure that it never would, were almost paralysed. The working man had severed his connection with the capitalist parties and what they had failed to give him as a mere matter of common human justice he demanded now in no uncertain way by sending his own representatives into parliament.

To-day everybody in England is discussing socialism. The capitalist papers are doing their utmost to split the party by separating the conservative Labor members from the socialist members. The "Daily Mail" during last summer ran a column called the "Fraud of Socialism." It is and always has been bitterly antagonistic to every aspiration of the working class; it has fought every measure for the benefit of the workers, but in this campaign it posed as the real friend of the working man. With a sensational appeal to the mass of trade unionists it endeavored to rouse them to "the raid the socialists were making upon their funds." According to the "Mail" the socialists were endeavoring to capture the unions by stealth and use them for their own nefarious and anti-social purposes. Other papers came into the battle. All Great Britain was discussing The Labor Party. Everybody wrote letters to the papers as everybody does in England, expressing views on the matter, and bishops, ministers, politicians and even the nobility began to take sides. Nothing has ever happened that has done more to advance socialism, and the socialists came out of the fight stronger than ever. But every capitalist influence in Great Britain is using all possible means to divide the workers. The weaker and more conservative members of the party are patted on the back and flattered; their vanity is worked upon; their jealousies and ambitions fed, and so the campaign progresses publicly and privately, openly and underhandedly to disrupt the party and disorganize the working classes. The capitalists want the working men to return to the good old days when "in the quiet, sensible and truly British fashion" they supported the ancient and honorable Liberal and Tory Parties.

Not the least important of the efforts that have been made to destroy The Labor Party has been the shrewd politics of the Liberal Party. It has given Labor all and more than it has asked for. It is my opinion that if the Labor Movement had not gone into independent politics, it would have worked ten years without getting the legislation that has been obtained im-

mediately by this new method of using its political power. I don't mean to say by this that the measures are of fundamental except by bringing to bear on the two old political parties power—I don't mean to say by this that the measures are of fundamental importance. All I mean to say is that even these petty measures in the interests of the workers could not have been obtained except by bringing to bear on the two old political parties powerful political pressure, and that pressure is best exercised by an independent political party. The old parties see that if they do not endeavor to placate labor, labor may return a hundred or more members to the next parliament and this means that many Tories and Liberals must lose their seats and therefore their political power. They begin to realize that they have got into “an awkward” situation, and so they now lavish upon labor evidences of their good will. But they do not do so because they love labor more than they have loved it in the past. It is because their political life has been threatened and the wise British masters have a curious way under such circumstances. They give nothing until they have to, but when no alternative is open to them, they give gracefully and after the manner of true philanthropists. It is a very skillful method of retaining power and even some of the labor members are puzzled and perhaps a bit inclined to think they have too harshly judged their masters; but the masters have yielded on no vital point and all they have given has been for the purpose of destroying the Labor Party. They hope that the measures passed this year will satisfy the mass of trade unionists and that they will gradually permit their independent political movement to die. The longheaded politics of the British statesman is the greatest danger that confronts the Labor Party.

With these things in my mind I went to the Labor Party congress at Belfast. It convened on the 24th of January for the purpose of discussing the progress of the last year, and of making plans for the year to come. On the morning of the 24th at 11 o'clock, 350 delegates, all but half a dozen of whom were working men, assembled in Wellington Hall. There were representatives from almost every trade and from almost every section of Great Britain. Most of them were trade union officials or had had experience in responsible positions in the trade union movement. There were very few men there known outside of England, although I instantly recognised some fifteen or twenty men whose names are well known. With the exception, however, of Hardie, Pete Curran, S. G. Hobson, Quelch, Ben Tillet, Jowett, Pease, Bruce Glasier, Will Thorne, O'Grady, a few members of parliament, and those who had been fraternal delegates to the congresses of the American Federation of Labor,

they were men unknown to us. Only a handful of the militant socialists whom we all know by name were there. Many of them are middle-class men and of course cannot come as representatives of unions. In fact the only members of the middle-class who were there were of the Independent Labor Party and the Fabian Society, both of which are affiliated to the Labor Party. It would have been possible for some of the well known men of the Social Democratic Federation to have been at the congress if they had retained their affiliation with the Labor Party, but as is well known, they withdrew from the organization in the early days of the movement. The congress, therefore, was distinctly working class. It was even more so than the German congress, and the movement in England represents more distinctly than any other movement in Europe, the class struggle in politics. From this point of view it was distinctly interesting to attend the gathering of these men.

The British workman has no theories. He is stolid, quiet thoughtful; he is practical, a good workman after his own quiet thoroughgoing way. The thing he is doing is an end in itself. If he is interested in co-operation, trade unionism or a labor party, he is interested in it for the practical good that can be obtained by the use of that thing itself. The Frenchman has his unions and co-operatives, but not at all because he cares about the immediate ends of these institutions. To him they are merely weapons, ammunition in the social revolution. But to the British working man these things are an end. If he wishes to exercise his power in co-operation with others in buying, selling, or producing, if he wishes to exercise his economic power by co-operating with his fellow workmen in trade unions, or if he desires to exercise his political power by uniting politically with his fellow workman, he does those things because he feels that there is some definite, concrete end of distinct advantage to himself that he wishes to obtain by these means. Formulas, fundamental principles and eternal verities irritate him. It is perhaps because of these fundamental traits of his character that he has formed one of the most distinctly class movements to be seen in the world, but he refuses to call himself class conscious or at present to discuss very seriously or exhaustively the advantages of the socialist state. For my own part while admiring the quick intelligence, the enthusiasm, and the high ideas of the Latin peoples, and the thorough thinking and fatal logic of the Germans, there is much in the British method which appeals to me, and I am not certain that the movement in Great Britain is not equally advanced with the movement elsewhere in Europe, simply because it refuses phrases which it does not fully understand. So long as it moves definitely on the lines of the class struggle itself

it is the most important matter, and that if the working classes can be united politically and economically against the exploiter of labor the rest will take care of itself.

This, however, is philosophy and may seem to the reader as having little to do with the congress itself, and in fact, if these ideas were not with me more or less matters of conviction, they would have been thrown overboard after the first day's session of the congress. It was the dullest, the most petty and most trying session of a serious body of men that I have ever happened to witness. All the questions were small, all the discussion was trifling. There was none of that fine idealism, lofty sentiment and passion for the welfare of humanity which enthused the French, German and Italian congresses. It was all machinery and organization like a Lancashire cotton-mill. The best thing of the session was the address of the chairman, Mr. J. J. Stephenson, a remarkably able young man and a thorough-going socialist and after that the report of the executive was offered. It showed, among other things, a very considerable increase over the last year in the membership of the party. In fact the growth of the party from the beginning is so strikingly shown, that it may be well to introduce here a very illuminative table of figures:

Trade Unions		Trades Councils and L. R. C's			Socialist Societies	Total
Year.	No.	M'ship.	No.	No.	M'ship.	M'ship.
1900-1	41	353,070	7	3	22,861	375,931
1901-2	65	455,450	21	*2	13,861	469,311
1902-3	127	847,315	49	2	13,835	861,150
1903-4	165	956,025	76	2	13,775	969,800
1904-5	158	885,270	73	2	14,730	900,000
1905-6	158	904,496	73	2	16,784	921,280
1906-7	174	974,509	83	2	20,885	**997,665

*Social Democratic Federation withdrew.

**This total includes 2271 Co-operators.

From these figures it will be seen that the party has about trebled in size since its beginning six years ago and the number of unions have increased fourfold. The miner's unions, which have thirteen men in Parliament, under the auspices of the Liberal Party, have not yet decided to join the independent movement. But the balloting on the question this last year was very close and showed that within a very short time the miners will also join the Labor Party. The report of the executive asked for the coming year a considerable increase in the administrative and electoral forces now employed by the committee. Up to the

present time the Labor Party has confined its efforts almost exclusively to the parliamentary elections although in the last municipal elections the labor and socialist votes amounted to nearly 300,000. It is proposed to take up systematically the municipal campaigns, and an effort will be made in the forthcoming elections for the London County Council to elect some representatives of the Labor Party.

The report of the chairman of the party in Parliament, Mr. J. Keir Hardie, was extremely interesting, and showed how great a force labor was becoming in British politics. He said, "As I have remarked elsewhere, the influence of the Party is beyond question. The object of those who pioneered and organized the Labor Movement was to create a political force which, by concentration on social and labor questions, would keep these from being obscured by mere political issues or relegated to the small hours of the morning in which oddments of reform are dealt with as matters of little moment. We have, however, been alive to the fact that no party could obtain or retain a footing in British politics which ignored the wider issues of our national life. Questions of foreign affairs, education, the welfare of subject races, militarism (that sinister foe of progress) and finance have all been dealt with by members of the Party speaking for their colleagues, whilst the Party vote has been cast on the side of a progressive policy both at home and abroad.

"The motions for which the Party has made itself responsible and which it directly brought before Parliament in the evenings which its members secured in the ballot, included one for the provision of Old Age Pensions out of State funds: the payment of trade-union rates to all government employees, and a recognition of the trade unions by the various Governmental departments. In addition there was a motion declaring for the **Political Enfranchisement of Women**, and another to put an end to the evictions of workmen on strike who happen to occupy houses belonging to their employers. A small bill to class as undesirables, aliens who are being brought into this country to take place of workmen on strike was successfully piloted by the Party through the House of Commons, and is now stranded somewhere in the House of Lords. On the Committees which dealt with Workman's Compensation, the Reform of the Income tax, the Procedure of the House of Commons, the Provision of Meals for School Children, Electric Supply, Taxation of Land Values (Scotland) the Nationalisation of Canals, the Postal Servants, and with various other subjects upon which the Special Committee have sat, members of the Party have been active and vigilant.

"The Party has also succeeded in obtaining by ballot two

of the first places for the eleven Fridays set apart for Private Members' Bills, and gave priority to,

(a) The Trades Disputes Bill.

(b) The Provision of Meals for Children Bill.

A third measure to provide for the right of workmen who are paid by weight or measurement to appoint checkweighers as is the law in the case of mines was also put down on the off-chance of its finding a place, but in this we were not successful.

"I have no desire to reopen old controversies, but it will be well within the public recollection that the Trades Disputes Bill introduced by the Government was subsequently not merely altered, but completely changed from its original draft in order to meet the views of the Party. It is questionable whether in the history of recent politics an instance is to be found which more conclusively proves the advantage of concentration upon a well-defined object than does that of the Trades Disputes Bill. Finally bills to enable Educational Authorities in England and Wales to provide meals for school children were brought forward by the Party, and referred to a Select Committee. The mere enumeration of these items is, I think, sufficient justification for our claim to be regarded as a non-partisan Labor Party. It has been charged against us that inasmuch as we have in the main, supported the Government in their measures, our independence is more assumed than real. This objection proceeds on the assumption that it is the business of the member of an independent party to be always running amuck at the Treasury Bench. Such critics forget that these would be the tactics of despair and we are not in a despairing mood. Thirty men cannot hope to monopolise the time of Parliament, and the most that can be expected from them is to see that value is received for the support which is given to the Government of the day. We have supported the Government and opposed the Government just as we deemed the interests of the workers required."

In the evening, before a large meeting for which many hundreds could only get standing room and hundreds of others were refused admission, Hardie spoke again of the work of the party. He said they were witnessing just now the emergence of a people from political and industrial bondage. If the Labor Party made mistakes, at least it did so while attempting to learn how to walk alone and it was better that it should stagger a little in its footsteps than attempt to lean on the wornout crutches of either a liberal or conservative party. He also ventured to say that no party in British politics ever came out of a single session with a better record of good work accomplished than the Labor Party. Three bills were known to them: The Trades Disputes Bill, restoring freedom to the trade union movement, the Work-

man's Compensation for injury, and last, but by no means least, a bill to enable the educational authorities to provide meals for starving children at public cost. That was a record of which no party need be ashamed. He also called attention to the very striking fact that while all other bills before the House had been weakened by compromise as they passed through, the labor bills were immensely strengthened in their passage through the House of Commons. He ventured to say that that could never have before been said of labor measures. He said that the Labor Party must be more than a reforming party. A labor party without an ideal could not last. There must be some Holy Grail which they were ever in search of, which they were making sacrifices to reach, and which would inspire and enable the men and women comprising the Party to do mighty deeds for the advancement of their cause. Many of them in the Labor Party — most of them — found that ideal in Socialism. They were not content to be merely a Red Cross Brigade to staunch the wounds caused by the system under which they lived. They stood for reform, for progress, and finally for freedom of the class to which they belonged.

The second day of the congress was more interesting. The discussion was no longer confined to details, but certain important questions of policy came up for discussion. For the first time one could gauge the real strength of socialism. Unfortunately, however, the resolution upon which the first discussion took place was meant to exclude from the party all but those who were definitely socialist. As a result the socialist strength was largely exhibited in opposition to the motion. The motion was proposed by the Paper Stainers' Union of General Workers and seconded by Quelch of the Social Democratic Federation. The executive of the Party had asked Pete Curran to oppose the motion. He said among other things that the resolution if carried out would mean the exclusion of all men who were not pledged to the class conscious principle. That might suit some people, but as a socialist it did not suit him. The mover and the seconder knew quite well that if the resolution were carried it would destroy the movement. He insisted that it was neither in the interest of the solidarity of the movement nor of socialism throughout the trade unions that the motion was proposed, and, therefore, with all the vigour at his disposal he would resist it, regarding it as a subterfuge for the purpose of creating dissension in the ranks. This was very much the line of discussion taken by the ablest socialist in the congress. Hardie regretted that the motion had come up in this form as it prevented socialism being discussed upon its merits. Many good socialists present who would have voted for a socialist statement would, he

said, be compelled to vote against the present resolution. As the socialist unions and organizations voted practically unanimously against the measure, the resolution was defeated by 835,000 against 98,000 votes.

Mr. Ben Tillet shortly afterwards moved the adoption of the following new clause, "Every Labor Party member of parliament candidate or delegate shall be a member of a bona-fide trade union, professional or trade organization recognised by the executive." This resolution was supported by Mr. Quelch. The resolution was aimed at excluding from the party the members of the Independent Labor Party and the Fabian Society, as we know, socialist organizations. Having failed to exclude the non-socialist trade unions, it was apparently the tactics of those of the social-democrats who were there, to exclude the socialists of all but trade union organizations. These are but two samples of the contemptible tactics of certain socialists! They first endeavoured to wreck the organization by forcing out all those who are not avowed socialists, and failing that, they made an effort to force out the middle-class socialists, now members of the Party, many of whom had taken an active part in its formation. The tactics of these socialists were, "Anything to wreck the new party," but the only result of these efforts was further to discredit these men and to injure the influence of the Social Democratic Federation in the new movement. However, these and similar motions in an indirect way brought forth a discussion which proved pretty conclusively that if the rank and file of the union men are not yet socialists, the ablest militants and most capable leaders in the new movement are thoroughgoing socialists.

The last day of the congress was interesting only because of one incident. After a number of resolutions were hurriedly voted upon, and other important matters decided, in the few minutes immediately before the close of the session, a resolution came up dealing with Woman's Suffrage, a question which has been recently agitating England in a very sensational way. Hardie, ever since the movement assumed definite form has manifested on every possible occasion great sympathy for it. During the last session the Party in the House pledged itself to the effect that women's suffrage would be one of the first measures that the Party would advance this year. A resolution was brought before the Conference which read as follows: —

"That this Conference declares in favour of adult suffrage and the equality of the sexes, and urges an immediate extension of the rights of suffrage, and of election, to women on the same conditions as to men."

The resolution seemed satisfactory as it left to the parlia-

mentary group the ability to support any measure in the direction of complete adult suffrage. Mr. Quelch, however, moved an amendment. He expressed himself in favour of equal voting rights being extended to all men and women but he demanded that the Party oppose any restricted measure. This was of course for the purpose of preventing the Labor Party from supporting in any way the present limited suffrage bill before Parliament. The delegates were evidently largely in favour of passing the amendment and instantly all over the hall there were cries of "Vote." When Hardie arose to speak, however, the Conference listened to him. It had been said that the bill would only permit women with property to vote and that Hardie had dropped the Unemployed Agitation in favour of Woman's Suffrage. In answer to these and other objections Hardie said briefly that if the bill were a property qualification bill he would not support it, neither would he support it if it were an attempt to put women's suffrage before a remedy for unemployment. What was the fact? Women to-day were classed with criminals and lunatics as being unfit to exercise the vote. There were no men so classed? (Voices: "There are") "No; a man did not require to have property to have a vote; his was a householding qualification. The bill did not propose to establish any new qualification at all. Under it two millions of women would be enfranchised, and of these $1\frac{3}{4}$ millions would be working women. The difficulty about the Bill was that people would not take the trouble to understand it."

The vote was taken, and it was found that the resolution was lost by 605,000 to 268,000. A loud cheer from the majority, almost the only demonstration of the kind that had followed any vote of the Conference, greeted the result.

No one seemed to have thought that the amendment would carry with it any serious consequences, but to the astonishment and dismay of everyone but the enemies of the Labor Movement, Hardie, after expressing the thanks of the Congress for the hospitality of the Belfast workers, made the following important statement:

"Twenty-five years ago this year I cut myself adrift from every relationship political and otherwise, in order to assist in building up a working-class party. I had thought the days of my pioneering were over. Of late I have felt with increasing intensity the injustice which had been inflicted upon women by the present political laws. The intimation I wish to make to the Conference and friends is that, if the motion they carried this morning was intended to limit the action of the Party in the House of Commons, I shall have to seriously consider whether I can remain a member of the Parliamentary Party.

"I say this with great respect and feeling. The party is largely my own child, and I would not sever myself lightly from what has been my life's work. But I cannot be untrue to my principles, and I would have to be so were I not do to my utmost to remove the stigma resting upon our wives, mothers and sisters of being accounted unfit for political citizenship."

These words fell upon the Conference like a bomb.

The Conference of the Labor Party was over, but for a long time the men stood about the hall not knowing what to do and we all went sadly away. It was an immense surprise to everyone and no one, not even Hardie's most intimate friends, had felt that he would treat so seriously his defeat. But Hardie believes, and rightly believes, that the right of suffrage is a fundamental fight of democracy, and he afterwards said in answer to a friend who wrote him urging him not to resign and that socialism must be first: — What my friend "overlooks is the fact that with us it is Socialism first *because we already have the vote*. With our voteless fathers it was votes first. In Russia just now it is votes first; in Belgium the same; and so it would be here if men were outside the franchise as women are. Our fathers fought against class disability just as the women are now fighting against sex disability. If only that fact could be grasped, all the trouble would disappear." Later in the same statement Hardie says: — "The spectacle of women being treated as though they were dogs or pariahs revolts and humiliates me; their admission to citizenship on terms of political equality with me is with me a sacred principle, and I would not wish to be in association with any movement or party which could be guilty of the unfairness and the injustice of denying to women those rights which men claim for themselves."

It was, I must confess, a conference neither impressive nor uplifting. The first day bored everyone, and at the end, as the reader must well see, we went away sad and depressed. In contrast with the continental congresses, the men of the Labor Party lacked the passion and warmth which come only with the possession of a great ideal. Everywhere in these foreign countries the masses are fired with a new religion and the cold machine-like method of The Labor Party chilled the enthusiasm that had steadily grown in me ever since I began to observe the movement on the continent. There are perhaps many explanations that might be given. Perhaps it is because the movement is just beginning, and the detailed questions of organization pressed themselves forward so that little time remained for developing the ideas which the movement must have if it is to rank with similar movements the world over. Perhaps this coldness is inherent in the British temperament. But whatever the cause the

lack of far vision in the Labor Movement irritates and saddens a great many socialists. I have at various times talked with many who refuse to identify themselves with the new movement because they fear it is not and never will become a socialist movement. I must confess, however, that I do not know how any socialist can take this view. Indeed I have no sympathy for it. —The party represents the working-class. It is a class struggle in politics. It is a definite class organization, and while it maintains its absolute independence of the capitalist parties, it extends an open hand of welcome to every socialist whether of the working class or not who belongs to an affiliated organization. No member or parliamentary representative is limited in any expression of his views. Certainly no better opportunity was ever offered socialists in any country to carry on their propaganda, and even to lead the working-class into the lines of socialist development. As I write this, a famous saying of Liebknecht comes to my mind. When Liebknecht was an exile in England, he and Marx used to go to the Communist Alliance of London, but Marx finally left it in disgust because of its stupidity and unscientific thinking. Liebknecht, however, remained in the Alliance, partly at least, for the purpose of trying to explain to them Marx' doctrine. When Marx heard of this he bitterly assailed Liebknecht as "a mediator" and insisted that he did not want to be understood by such workmen. Liebknecht retorted by saying that it was "crazy tactics for a workingmen's party to seclude itself away up above the workers in a theoretic aircastle: without workingmen, no workingmen's party, and the laborers we must take as we find them." These were the tactics of the greatest leader of the modern socialist movement, and they were responsible for the building of the great German Social Democracy. It would be wise if some of the English socialists who still refuse to connect themselves with the new movement, were to adopt similar tactics.

ROBERT HUNTER.

The Political Situation in France.

FOR the last three months, apart from the clerical question, which for the French working class has now become a secondary matter, the struggle for the weekly rest day voted for by parliament and constantly violated, especially by the small employers, has been the great question of the day in the proletarian and socialist life of France. This situation is very instructive for the sociologist, and especially for the socialist steeped in the Marxian conception, which alone furnishes him a means for understanding the facts and the attitude of the different political parties. But, first I wish to sketch briefly for the American reader the recent political evolution of France.

It will be remembered that in the last parliamentary election, May 1906, a heavy majority was obtained by the radical party, which corresponds closely enough to your democratic party, at least the Bryan wing.

Already in the two preceding parliaments, from 1899 to 1902 and 1902 to 1906, the radicals had had a majority. But this majority was precarious, since to govern in parliament the radical ministers had to depend on the help of the section of former opportunists which had left the opportunist party (that party corresponds pretty closely to your republican party) at the time of the Dreyfus affair, to stand with the radicals and socialists in defense of democratic institutions. These were threatened by the Nationalists, the Clericalists and the Monarchists, who counted on the support of the mass of the opportunist party, apart from those dissenting opportunists who followed Waldeck-Rousseau, who had been up to that time the representative par excellence of "Capitalist Republicanism".

It was under these conditions that Waldeck-Rousseau formed a cabinet with the radicals and that in 1902 he was replaced by Combes, who accenuated this policy in the direction of anti-clericalism. At the same time a considerable group of Socialist deputies, entangled in the policy of collaboration with the "advanced" parties of the bourgeoisie, sustained these ministries in a consistent fashion by their votes. Nevertheless these radical majorities from 1899 to 1906 were not homogeneous since they comprised on the Right the Waldeckists or former Opportunists, called "Group of the Democratic Union", which often threatened to abandon the Government as too advanced and on the Left the Socialists who, in spite of their policy of

combination, at some times made occasional demands which were considered *too revolutionary*.

This situation was still further complicated by the successful formation of the socialist "Unity" after the Amsterdam Congress, which was finally brought about in April, 1905. The majority of the fusing socialists, including Jaures, de Pressense, and Rouanet then united with the uncompromising socialists like Guesde and Vaillant to form a single class party which inevitably took, in the Chamber, an attitude of resolute independence toward the bourgeois parties and leaders. The few self-styled socialists of the Jaures group who refused to join the "Unity" were mainly composed of ambitious politicians desirous of entering into a ministry, a thing which the "Unity" did not permit. This was notably the case with Briand and Viviani, who at the present moment are both in the Clemenceau cabinet, one as Minister of Public Instruction; the other as Minister of Labor, a post created for Viviani, but the little group called "Independent Socialists" did not suffice (there were only about fifteen of them) to replace in the governmental majority all the deputies of the socialist "Unity". It was in this way that the Combes ministry fell and a ministry representing rather the interests of finance and greater capitalism, the ministry half Waldeckist, half Rouvier radical, was formed in April, 1905. Soon, however, it fell and on the eve of the election, in March 1906, the radicals gained the upper hand. It was replaced by the Sarrien-Clemenceau ministry. Sarrien represented moderate radicalism; Clemenceau the more-advanced radicalism. Sarrien being a man of no great force of character was rapidly eliminated by Clemenceau, especially after the elections of May, 1906.

These elections resulted in a startling victory for all the parties of the Left. The organized socialists, whom the capitalist parties ironically gave the name "The Unified", obtained 52 seats as against 37 in the preceding parliament. The "Independent Socialists" increased their representation from 16 to 20 and the radicals, who had held 230 seats, raised their number to more than 320. The reactionary parties, opportunists, nationalists and monarchists were crushed, in spite of their attempt to profit by the law of the Separation of Church and State. This law had been voted in 1905 under the ministries of Combes and Rouvier as a sequel to the aggressions of the papacy, and, thanks to the socialists, it was enacted in a spirit of broad tolerance,*

*) The French radicals, who are thorough Jacobins, having the old tradition of the ideological struggle against Catholicism, wished to enact a much more rigorous law. On several occasions the socialists, with Jaures, voted with the opportunists for certain more tolerant articles of the law. In spite of this the French socialists are accused, in America, of persecuting the Church.

so that no voters took very seriously the lamentations over their persecutions of which the clericals pretended to be victims.

But the radicals, in spite of their victories, had their souls poisoned by the success, relatively greater than theirs, of the terrible "Unified" who refused to take part in the pretty little arrangement for co-operative housekeeping and had the presumption to remain a class party, absolutely independent. And so it was that their great orator and minister, Clemenceau, delivered himself on his return to parliament in June 1906, of a violent attack against the socialist doctrine in response to Jaures, a part of whose speech is already familiar to the readers of this Review.* Clemenceau showed that while thoroughly imbued with the philosophy of the eighteenth century, the encyclopedists and the philosophy of the eighteenth century, the encyclopedists and the immune to the conceptions of modern socialism as defined by Marx and Engels, and as they emerge at once from the philosophy of modern development and from the daily experience of the organized working class on both sides the Atlantic.

Nevertheless the radical party and its leaders fully realized that after their imposing victory at the polls it was incumbent on them to give the proletarian masses in city and country something more than the sarcasms of the Ministry of the Interior upon the bad working—hypothetical, of course—of the future collectivist system or than complaints about the "iron discipline" wickedly imposed by the socialist party upon its members. In a stirring speech, after the ministers had announced their reform program, Jaures had hurled at them this startling accusation, "You do not stand on Universal Suffrage." ("Vous etes au dessous du Suffrage Universel").

It was for the radicals to prove, on the contrary, that they were in close touch with the wishes of the country and that they knew how to realize them. The difficulty was great for this party of the little bourgeoisie which for thirty-five years had always been able to satisfy its constituency by "hitting the priest" and systematically ignoring economic problems, claiming like the petit bourgeois democratic parties of all countries to "rise above class lines".

Two reforms had been practically demanded by the French proletariat notably at the time of the recent May Day demonstrations. These were the eight hour day and a law establishing the weekly rest day for all municipalities. The establishment of the legal work day of eight hours, or even ten hours as is vaguely promised by a draft for a law in the distant future, clashed with too many capitalist interests. On the other hand,

*) See International Socialist Review for September, 1906.

the government thought that the establishment of a weekly rest day for all laborers would meet with the unanimous support of all parties and, in fact the Chamber, fresh from its promises to the good people, voted enthusiastically and almost unanimously the first draft of the law. Who could protest against so humane a measure! Was it endurable that the very "future of the French race" should be threatened longer by the debilitating labor imposed upon the workmen in certain crafts such as bakers or cooks who often had not a single rest day a month.

The current was so strong that even in the senate where, as with you, all labor laws passed by the lower house generally go to pieces, the vote for the reform was not delayed more than a few months; it was finally enacted at the end of last October.

But then from all sides came violent protests from the capitalists. The great employers, however, almost everywhere yielded before the pressure of organized labor. On the other hand, the whole class of small employers and small merchants, who, sad to say, are the very class represented by the radicals, began to protest violently against the "ill-considered" law for they dared not attack the principle of the law itself. They merely wished to be allowed such exceptions and combinations that any control on the part of the labor inspectors should become impossible.

Pulled one way by the class whose psychology they especially represented and the other way by the proletariat, firmly resolved not to lose the benefit of the reform, the government and radical majority are greatly embarrassed. In spite of the demands of the small employers and merchants they have not dared to nullify or modify the law by legislative action. On the other hand, in practice the ministry and especially the Minister of Labor (the self-styled "socialist" Viviani) has felt itself called to close its eyes often upon the violation of the new law. Along this line there have been published in the socialist press and especially in the *Humanite'*, circulars of the Minister of Labor to the factory inspectors counseling them to apply only with moderation and reserve the legal penalties which had been incurred.

The same radical government headed its platform with the nationalization of railroads and to begin with that of the Western Line, (Normandy and Britany). This has been voted by the Chamber but the great capitalist interests are fighting it bitterly and there is every reason to fear that finally the senate will reject the reform. The government does not seem in any way resolved to act energetically to break down this resistance of our "House of Lords".

Likewise again the law for workingmen's pensions, voted by the preceding Chamber before the election, is chronically be-

fore the senate, which refuses, on account of insufficient financial resources, to give the old laborers the crumb of bread which the republican government has promised them for so long. The government, however, does not act. I might add again that had it not been for the ardent and incessant campaign of the socialists, the same government would have permitted the Russian government to float its abominable loan with the support of the Christian or Jewish financiers of France to afford means for slaughtering the Jewish or Christian proletarians of Russia. At the moment of writing it is not yet known whether Rouvier, the former Prime Minister, now at the head of a syndicate of the great banks of Paris, will yet have succeeded through the weakness of the government in carrying through this loan "under private uniform".

In spite of all this the working class is organizing itself and its strength is growing everywhere. The socialist party, which in its several sections, then antagonistic, numbered in 1894 at the time of the Amsterdam Congress scarcely 20,000 members, has at the present moment more than 60,000.

The relations between the political organization of the working class and the federation to which our trade unionists belong were until lately about as bad as possible on account of the socialist dissensions which had been echoing for twenty years in labor circles. To-day we are coming closer and closer to a complete and lasting understanding between the federation and the socialist party. This will make the condition of the proletariat so much the more healthful, and will give new efficiency to its combined efforts.

JEAN LONGUET,

Translated by Charles H. Kerr.

The Russian Bastille.

I.

THE history of mankind gives the assurance that the principles of liberty will ultimately triumph over oppression, and that human happiness will sometime cease to be only a dream. But the road to liberty is covered with so many martyrs, and the pages of history are soiled with so much of humanity's blood, that one often despairs of the cause of the human race."

Such are the words of Mr. L. Melshin-Jacoubovitch, a Russian poet, journalist and revolutionist, in his book, "The Schlüsselburg Prisoners", recently published in St. Petersburg. They are words embodying thoughts which inevitably force themselves upon anyone who has formed only cursory knowledge of the facts concerning the prison near St. Petersburg, known as the Schlüsselburg Fortress, which was abolished after the manifesto of October, 1905, and which for years held within its walls the ablest and noblest pioneers produced by the Russian revolution.

The Schlüsselburg Fortress was not an ordinary prison. It was a Bastille—a place for the arbitrary incarceration, torture and execution of political offenders. It is situated on an island in the Neva, thirty-five miles north of St. Petersburg. In earlier days it had been used as a prison, but not until the summer of 1884, after a long period of disuse and desertion, was it consigned to the purpose which it so effectively served for more than twenty-one years.

Before that time the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress, within the boundaries of the capital, was the national Bastille. The Alexeieff Ravelin, a tower within this fortress, kept the imprisoned revolutionists in absolute seclusion. It was well equipped for confining its inmates, and it served all purposes of the government. But causes arose which made necessary the removal of these dangerous prisoners to a more isolated place, and the Schlüsselburg Fortress was chosen.

II.

The period in Russian history following the emancipation of the serfs was marked by wide-spread discontent. The reformers had come to realize that emancipation, instead of being a great reform, was but a measure of deceit and a means of enrichment for the nobility and the government. The heavy

payments which the peasants were compelled to make for the land that had ostensibly been given to them, and the restrictions placed upon their civic life for the purpose of securing these payments, had firmly fastened upon them a new system of dependence on the bureaucracy. Uprisings followed all over the land, and oppressive measures increased. The peasants were wholly disregarded in their demands for land, and were kept in ignorance, while new and oppressive powers were given to the police, and the press was again placed under a censorship similar to that under Nicholas I.

For the first time in history, a revolutionary movement took hold of all Russia, and propagandists and agitators covered not less than thirty-seven provinces, as officially stated by Count Palen, then secretary of justice. The so-called political case of "50" stirred the entire nation. During the following year more than a thousand men and women were arrested, their arrests resulting in the famous trial of "193." The propaganda was peaceful. The society *Semlia e Volia* (Land and Liberty), to which most of the propagandists belonged, was more an educational organization than a political party. But though the agitation was peaceful, it was met by prosecution more severe than any previously known in Russian history. The methods of oppression that were employed inflamed the educated Russian youth, and the party *Narodnaia Volia* (People's Will), with terrorism as its principal weapon, was organized. The world then witnessed a heroic duel between a small number of men and women and a tremendous army of gendarmes, prosecutors and spies. The movement was bound to fail, since it was one almost purely of "intellectuals" having but little foundation in the will of the masses. But until it was crushed, in 1887, it kept the government in constant fear for its existence.

The more dangerous revolutionists whose lives were spared by the gendarmes were thrown into the Alexeieff Ravelin of the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress. As a result of its régime, most of the prisoners were soon attacked by consumption, insanity or other diseases. Among the first to perish were Alexander Michailoff, Obolesheff, Barannikoff, Kletchnikoff, Langans, Kolodkevich, Shiraieff, Telaloff, all members of the *Narodnaia Volia*. There was fear that other prisoners might soon follow. Through a conspiracy between prisoners and guards, in 1881, however, some modification of the grosser cruelties of the dungeon was obtained, and the lot of the inmates was for a time made more tolerable.

The head of this conspiracy was Sergius Netchaieff, who had organized a revolutionary movement in 1869. Escaping to Switzerland, he had been extradited in 1872 on the false plea

that he was a felon, and not a political offender. Tried in 1873, he had been sentenced to ten years at hard labor and subsequent banishment to Siberia. He was imprisoned in the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress, and in 1877, before his term had expired, had been tried for violation of the rules of the fortress and sentenced to life imprisonment. He was the first revolutionist who succeeded in winning over the soldiers of the prison guard. These soldiers not only established for him a system of communication with the executive committee of his party, but they even conspired to place the Emperor under arrest on his visit to the fortress. It was during the time when the *Narodnaia Volia* was bent upon assassinating Alexander II., and the executive committee placed Netchaieff in the dilemma of choosing the liberation of all prisoners, including himself, or the assassination of Alexander II. One enterprise excluded the other, and there was fear that if all the prisoners were to escape from the fortress, the Czar would, in his fear, take extraordinary precautions for his safety, and a new era of persecutions would follow.

Without a murmur Netchaieff refused to be liberated. Alexander II. fell on the 1st day of March, 1881. Netchaieff remained in the fortress. But soon thereafter the police discovered the garrison's conspiracy. Forty soldiers were arrested and tried in December, 1882. To this day the fate of Netchaieff is unknown. After the discovery of the conspiracy, the government decided to place the dangerous political prisoners beyond possible reach. Count Dimitri Tolstoi, then the Secretary of the Interior, ordered the re-establishment of that historical dungeon and mainstay of autocracy, the Schlüsselburg Fortress. The old prison, within the walls of which Czarowitz Johann Antonowitch was strangled and other enemies of the old Czars had perished, was hurriedly renovated and repaired, and the Russian Bastille was founded.

III.

In August, 1884, the first barge with twelve prisoners left the Ravelin for Schlüsselburg. On the barge the prisoners were allowed to see one another. Chained hand and foot, they were placed in separate cells in the swimming prison. This was the gloomy prologue to the history of the Bastille.

A long, narrow and dark corridor, hardly lit by lamps; small, damp, half-dark cells on both sides of the corridor, barred and locked by iron and steel; all about the corridors gendarmes and wardens, now and then looking into the openings of the cell-doors; sentinels outside; towers and walls surrounding the prison yards and cells and water all around—such was the dungeon to which these prisoners were consigned.

The question of who "deserved" Schlüsselburg was regulated by rules embodied in the General Code of Laws, which provided that only revolutionists who after a trial were sentenced to hard labor for lifetime or whose death sentence was commuted to a term of years at hard labor, were to be placed in the Bastille. There were other prisons in European and Asiatic Russia in which revolutionists were confined. The Bastille, however, purported to serve as a permanent threat to all Russia, and the final disposition of prisoners was therefore left to the discretion of the Department of Police.

The Police Department used its discretion freely. Thus there were to be found in the Bastille among the life prisoners men like Vasily Karaouloff, who had been sentenced to four years of hard labor and to subsequent deportation to Siberia. There was also to be found there one Michael Lagovsky, an army officer, who having been punished by administrative order, was also to be deported to Siberia. But after the expiration of his term, of five years, the Police Department, without cause, prolonged his imprisonment to a life term.

At the end of 1884 the Bastille held thirty-five men: eleven from the Ravelin, eleven new arrivals from the Kara Prison in Siberia, eleven participants in the "Military" case of Vera Figner, two of whom (Stromberg and Rogatcheff) had been hanged immediately upon their arrival, and four participants in the famous Kieff case of 1884. During the following two years a few were added, among whom were the participants in the "Proletariat" case from Warsaw. In 1887 a new array, victims of the last famous trials of the *Naronaia Volia*, were brought in, some of them only for the purpose of execution. Thus five men (Ulianoff, Generaloff, Osipanoff, Andreiushkin and Shevareff) of the seven so-called "First of March Men" were hanged a few days after their arrival. They were charged with the attempt upon the life of Alexander III. in March, 1887. Then came Herman A. Lopatin and his comrades and Borris Orgik. Lopatin and Orgik were the last organizers of the *Narodnaia Volia*, who fell in their attempt to re-organize and re-establish their party. From 1887 on, political trials in Russia ceased, the government preferring punishment by administrative order; and from that year up to the close of the Bastille, for the period of seventeen years, only eleven men and women were added to the list of "dangerous," among whom were Sophie Ginzberg, accused of conspiracy against the life of Alexander III., and all members of the party of Revolutionary Socialists, accused or convicted of terrorist acts, with Gershuni, the leader of the Fighting Organization, at their head. Thus during twenty-one years of its existence the Bastille had held sixty-seven men and

women. The amnesty, however, found in the Bastille only thirteen out of the sixty-seven originally imprisoned.

During these years only fourteen men and women left Schlüsselburg. The fate of the remainder is most tragic.. *Thirteen were shot or hanged within the walls of the prison. Four committed suicide in jail. Fifteen died of consumption, insanity or other diseases. Only three of the insane were allowed to leave the Bastille.* Among these prisoners the following men and women are specially to be noted:—

Alexander Dolgushin was the oldest prisoner. In 1874 he was sentenced to ten years at hard labor for the publication of three proclamations. He had never taken part in the terrorist acts. On his way to hard labor in Siberia he defended a comrade from an attack made on him by an officer in the Krasnoarsk jail, and *for this interference he received fifteen years' additional servitude without a trial.* He was transferred from Siberia to the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress in 1883, and died in the Bastille in 1886.

Nicholas Stchedrin was twice sentenced to death, once for organizing the South Russian Labor Union in 1881, and once for attacking a prison official while the latter was passing insulting remarks to female prisoners. His treatment was exceedingly cruel. *For many years he was fastened to an iron cart, which he dragged wherever he went.* In 1886 he became insane. Up to 1891 the authorities would not admit that he was insane, and they even placed him in a cell specially designated for disorderly prisoners. Not until 1896 did they transfer him to Kasan Institution for the Insane.

Michael Trigoni was a friend of the famous Andrew Sheliaboff, who in 1881, together with Sophie Perovskaia and others, was tried for the assassination of Alexander II. Trigoni protected Sheliaboff against the police for some time and kept him in his house, where both were finally arrested by spies. After twenty years of servitude Trigoni was deported to Saghalien, where he was rescued during the Japanese War by Dr. Nicholas Russel, a representative of the Revolutionary Socialists.

Nicholas Morosoff, who was the editor of the revolutionary journal, *Land and Liberty*, took part in several famous trials and was known as the poet of the *Narodnaia Volia*. Jointly with Alexander Michailoff, the organizer, and Andrew Sheliaboff, the leader, he formed the most influential circle in the executive committee of their party.

Michael Frolenko was known for many daring enterprises, among which was the successful rescue from jail of the well-known Social Democrat, Leo Deutsch, author of "Sixteen Years in Siberia."

Peter Polivanoff, author of the "*Alexeieff Ravelin*" and of a remarkable letter to Secretary Muravieff, served twenty-two years. Many times he attempted suicide in the Bastille. After his release he was sent to Siberia. Subsequently he escaped and reached France in safety. He finally committed suicide in a suburb of Paris.

Vera Figner had first taken part in the organizing of "Land and Liberty," but soon devoted her energy to terrorist acts, and finally established the first military organization in connection with the *Narodnaia Volia*. She was arrested in 1883, and released in 1904.

Ludmila A. Volkenstein took part in the agitation of the "People's Will" party and was one of the prisoners at the Figner "Military" trial. She was arrested in 1883, released in 1896, and sent to Saghalien. She wrote her memoirs about the Bastille, known as "*Thirteen Years in Schlüsselburg*." During the Japanese War she was transferred to Vladivostok, where only a few months ago she was killed in a street demonstration of mutineers.

The fate of Michael Popoff, one of the oldest prisoners, was particularly tragic. He was sentenced in 1879, and sent to Siberia. From there, with sixteen others, he was transferred to the Bastille, being charged with an attempted escape, in which he took no part. He survived all his comrades and served the longest term.

IV.

The régime in prison during the eighties, when at the head of the Russian gendarmery stood men like Shebecco, Orjevsky and Pleve, may be characterized as most atrocious. Sokoloff, the brutal warden of the Alexeieff Ravelin, was placed in command of the new prison. He was an ignorant, cruel soldier and always ready, as he said, "to kill his parents, if ordered by superiors." The prisoners called him "Herod." All communications between the prisoners by knocking on the walls, singing, whistling, rapid walking, as well as interviews or correspondence with relatives or friends, were forbidden. For violation of the rules, disobedient prisoners were beaten, bound and incarcerated in dark cells, and deprived of their daily promenade and of their meals. The meals were worse than those in the Russian army. Foul food was given even to sick prisoners. When, as a result of such diet, almost all the prisoners became sick, and there was fear that they all might perish, those who were dangerously ill received a small portion of milk and were allowed more time for promenade. But as soon as a prisoner's health improved the milk would disappear. No books except

the New Testament were allowed. There was no hospital attached to the jail. The iron bed in each cell was closed early in the morning, and even the sick or dying were compelled to lie upon the cold floor, their expectoration making the surroundings dangerous for the rest. As an instance, the case of Arontchik may be cited. Paralyzed and insane, he remained in his cell for more than two years. Judging from the number of deaths in prison, we may say that this was not an exceptional case.

For new arrivals and those who were guilty of slight offenses in prison, disciplinary cells were in readiness. They were dungeons in a separate part of the building, damp and dark, known among the prisoners as the "Stable." They had been established by "Herod" in the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress and were subsequently introduced by him in the Bastille. Mr. Melshin asserts that once placed in the "Stable," the revolutionists were subjected to extraordinary brutalities and that few left it alive.

The Schlüsselburg régime thus continued the deadly work begun by the Sts. Peter and Paul Fortress. The heroes of the "People's Will," one after another, descended into their graves in proud silence, never repenting, pleading or petitioning. It was the desire of those in power to force these men and women to plead for clemency or pardon. Orjevsky, Shebecco and Pleve had cynically defended the system in vogue in the Bastille, on the ground that it had for its "good" object the breaking of the will of the prisoners. But the history of the Bastille does not record one case of a "broken will," of a plea for mercy or leniency!

Of course, the system provoked stormy protests by the incarcerated men and women. General and individual hunger strikes frequently took place. In one case Michael Shebalin, as a protest against his unlawful imprisonment in Schlüsselburg, refused meals during twenty-one days. He demanded his return to his wife and son in Siberia. The unfortunate man did not know that they had died long before in the Moscow prison. In 1899 the entire prison starved for eleven days in order to remove restrictions placed upon their little library, enlarged sometime before. But this method of protest, agonizing for the prisoners, was not very effective. The prison keepers well knew that it was hard to accomplish death in this manner, as only a few could endure hunger for any length of time. Then, too, it was possible to feed by force those who weakened. Such forcible feeding was practiced many a time by the lackeys in the Bastille, who bore the name of physicians. The conduct of the prison physicians was such that in 1885, Ippolit Mishkin, in a fit of

anger, threw a dish at Dr. Zarkovitch, one of the physicians. For this act he was court-martialed and shot. He had long sought death, and purposely committed the act.

While a youth, Mishkin was a reporter for the reactionary Moscow *Vedomosti*. In 1871 he was sent by Katkoff, the editor of the paper, to report the trial of the so-called Netchaieff conspirators. Here Mishkin for the first time became acquainted with revolutionary ideas, and he soon after determined to devote his life to the revolution. In 1875, dressed like a gendarme, Mishkin went to Viluisk, in the Yakutsk province in Siberia, to rescue Tchernichevsky, the famous writer and economist, who was at hard labor there. Tchernichevsky had been the hope of the revolutionists for a number of decades, and many men and women dreamed of his rescue and attempted it at various times. Mishkin presented to the local authorities an order from the Irkutsk chief of gendarmes, directing them to place Tchernichevsky in his custody for transportation to Irkutsk. Mishkin was, however, suspected and compelled to flee, which he did in a boat, and sailed north on the Lena River. He was caught and taken to Russia, where he was wanted for his agitation among the peasants and for the establishment of a secret printing plant. After a preliminary imprisonment, which lasted four years, Mishkin was tried in the famous trial of "193," together with Katherine Breshkovsky. His speech in court was for many years considered the gospel of revolution. He was sentenced to ten years at hard labor. While in the Central Prison in Charkoff, awaiting deportation to Siberia, he made an unsuccessful attempt to escape by the way of an opening in a wall, which he himself dug out. While in the Irkutsk jail, Mishkin made his famous speech at the grave of a revolutionist, Dimochovsky. Denouncing the system which brought about the early death of his comrade, he closed by saying: "And upon the soil drenched with the blood of the martyrs, the tree of liberty will rise!" For this speech Mishkin's term of hard labor was prolonged. Katherine Breshkovsky, in her biography of Mishkin, comments upon these incidents in his life as follows: "Two speeches—two hard labors." From Kara he made a successful escape with a workman named Krustchoff, and even reached Vladivostok. But an insignificant incident again placed him in the hands of the police. It was then that the government decided to imprison him in the Bastille.

Mishkin's insubordination was followed by that of Bunakoff, who also invited capital punishment by striking another prison official. This happened only three months after his term of imprisonment began.

Knocking on the walls, which for years was the only means

of communication between the prisoners, afforded great relief. The unwritten rule among the prisoners required that every knock should at all times be answered by the one to whom it had been directed, no matter how sick or exhausted he may have been. But each knock and answer invariably resulted in the incarceration of the offender, male or female, in the "Stable."

It should not be wondered at that the prisoners refused all favors from the gendarmes. When Chief Shebecco, on his visit to jail, offered to Madame Volkenstein the regards of her mother, she stopped him, saying: "Even about my mother I wish to hear nothing from you."

Another method of torture, more poignant than anything else described, was the placing and retaining of insane prisoners in the Bastille. Ignatius Ivanoff, who was an inmate of the Kasan House for the Insane prior to the re-establishment of the Bastille, was brought to the latter place apparently for the purpose of harassing the other prisoners, since he had been declared hopelessly insane in the institution from which he was taken. Shortly thereafter Stchedrin, Arontchik, Juvasheff, Pochitonoff and Konaskevich became insane. Insanity was the lot of a great many. Some were subject to quiet and harmless attacks of mental debility. Some had violent attacks; they laughed, they sang, they cried, they shouted, and their wild shouts shattered the nerves of the sane inmates. The latter considered it the height of happiness to see their afflicted comrades removed to a medical institution, and they often appealed to the authorities, on their visits to the jail, to remove the sick or insane, but mostly without avail.

Last, but not least, of the horrible incidents of this inferno were the executions. It was the rule to send those who were sentenced to death to the Bastille, there to be hanged within a day or two after their arrival. The unfortunate inmates invariably learned of the approaching execution of a newly arrived revolutionist. The jail promenades would cease. The noise around the prison would increase, the sound of the work about the gallows would tell the rest. The inmates could even see from the top of their cells the awful machinery. In 1884 Schlüsselburg saw the hanging of the army officers, Rogatcheff and Stronberg. In 1887 it saw the execution of five young students accused of conspiracy to assassinate Emperor Alexander III. Stephen Balmasheff, the author of the terrorist act against Secretary Sipiaguin and Ivan Kalaieff, who was responsible for the death of Prince Sergius, were also hanged there. In the same manner, Hyman Hershkovitz and Alexander Wasilieff, both minors, were executed. And as if to consecrate the Bastille with the blood of woman, Zinaida Konopliannikova, was hanged

after the Fortress had ceased to serve as a prison. Konopliannikova shot General Min, who as the commander of the punitive expedition during the month of December, 1905, slaughtered thousands of innocent men and women without a trial, hearing or investigation. The bodies of all victims were thrown into graves dug in the prison yard and chopped wood was placed on the graves.

Between 1887 and 1901 the Bastille had only one new prisoner, Sophie Ginzberg. Having been placed in a secluded tower, the girl committed suicide almost immediately thereafter, and even before she had an opportunity to communicate with her comrades. In 1901 young Karpowitch, author of the terrorist act against Secretary Bogolepoff, was brought in. He carried life and hope into the Bastille. During the previous years the female inmates, Vera Figner and Ludmila A. Volkenstein, were the only upholders of hope and courage. Many a man owed his life to these women. But still suicides continued. The most horrible case was that of Gratchevsky. He soon tired of the régime of torture and insult and decided to follow Mishkin's example. He assaulted one of the various wardens and demanded a trial. Because of the demand a trial was refused him, and he was declared insane. He was not, however, removed to an institution. He then attempted to starve himself, but was fed by force. Thereupon he threw kerosene from his lamp over himself and set it on fire. It was a most agonizing death, and even those in the distant "Stable" heard his shrieks. Not until after this tragedy did the police department grant privileges to the prisoners. New books were allowed, better meals introduced, work was permitted. The prohibition of communicating by knocks was not strictly enforced, and at times the prisoners were allowed to promenade by twos. After Sophie Ginzberg's suicide the prisoners were permitted to take care of their sick comrades. At the deathbed of the famous engineer, Yurkowsky, the prisoners were allowed to watch in turn. Madame Volkenstein, describing this singular incident, says that for a long time he refused to disclose the fact of his illness, believing that no help would come. The physician came to see him only upon the urgent request of his fellow prisoners. It was then that the administration, as if conscience stricken, made a special effort to save his life, refusing, however, to transfer him to a hospital in St. Petersburg. Before death he requested the warden to permit him to take leave of the two female prisoners. His request was granted. His was the only death at which prisoners performed their last duty to a departing comrade.

The régime, however, was not substantially affected by the

new privileges. For the slightest violation of a rule, the administration still continued its arbitrary and cruel punishments. Thus when Michael Popoff was caught sending a letter to his mother, the entire prison was deprived of the privilege of having books and magazines, although only magazines of previous years were allowed in jail.

VI.

The last thirteen inmates of the Bastille consisted of two parties. The first party of eight were the remaining old prisoners—Lopatin, Morosoff, Popoff, Frolenko, Antonoff, Ivanoff, Lukashevitch, and Novoruski; the second party of five—Gershuni, Sasonoff, Sikorsky, Melnikoff, and Karpowitch were the younger prisoners. The five young prisoners, although ordered released from the Bastille, were sent to Siberia and placed in the Akatoni hard labor prison.* The old prisoners served various terms, ranging from twenty-one to twenty-six years. Although their sentences were definite, they could never tell when their terms would actually expire. It was a principle of the autocracy to keep the inmates in ignorance of the time of their release; and even the imperial manifestos, which were now and then issued, commuting the sentence of convicts, did not always apply to them. In this respect the following is noteworthy:

Peter Polivanoff published in No. 27 of *Revolutionary Russia*, in July, 1903, and in No. 11 of *La Tribune Russe*, in February, 1904, an open letter to N. V. Muravieff, then Secretary of Justice in Russia, by which he hoped to call his attention to the unlawful régime in the Bastille and to ameliorate the condition of those who still lingered there. Citing the 14th Volume of the Code of Laws, and the Statute of Penalties, Polivanoff proves that the régime in the Bastille was a violation of all regulations embodied in the law, in that some inmates were illegally imprisoned and that the prohibition of seeing or corresponding with relatives was not at all provided by law. He further shows that Sections 299 and 310 of the Statute of Criminals, and Section 341 of Volume 14 of the Code of Laws, distinctly provided that each sentence should be reduced and that prisoners should be kept in jail or at hard labor only a certain part of their sentence and should thereafter be sent to settlements in Siberia, while paragraph 2 of the regulations of the Schlüsselburg Fortress unlawfully deprived its inmates of privileges which are allowed to ordinary convicts. He further contended that all prisoners except Karpovitch should have been freed long prior to the date of his letter; *that all of them had actually served time*

*) G. A. Gershuni escaped from Akatous within a short time after his arrival there and safely reached the United States.

in excess of their sentences, and that none of them had served less than eight years in excess of their respective terms; while one of them—Michael Popoff—had been kept there fifteen years beyond his term. Finally he showed that in violation of the general rule that a life sentence meant twenty years without the usual allowance, prisoners were being kept there a real life time, and that some of them who had served the lawful life sentence and who had been officially freed by the various manifestos, were still in jail, and that others having served the full sentence and having been freed by the manifestos, had died in jail long thereafter. Polivanoff's letter aroused public opinion in Europe, but it was ignored by Muravieff.

One of the eight men released in October, 1905, was Lopatin. In 1896 his sentence was commuted under a manifesto, but Secretary Goremykin specially petitioned the Czar that the commutation should not apply to Lopatin. A subsequent manifesto, known as that of August 11th, also failed to affect Lopatin's status. Count Mirsky refused to apply it to him for the reason that "Lopatin could himself petition the Czar." There was good reason why Lopatin should have been kept in Schlüsselsburg until freed by the revolutionary wave, which resulted in the amnesty of October, 1905. He was one of those wonderful Russians who devote themselves unreservedly to the cause of their country. His biography is a part of Russian revolutionary history. Born in 1845, in 1866 he had already finished his university education and was to become a professor of biology in the University of St. Petersburg. A man of unusual education, he was a friend of Karl Marx and Peter Lavroff, and he translated into Russian the greatest portion of the first volume of "Capital." In 1866 he was for the first time connected with a revolutionary circle, known as the circle of Korokosoff. In 1867 he took part in the Garibaldi crusade in Italy. Upon his return to Russia, his first arrest took place. A forcible speaker, witty and energetic, he was the object of persecution for a number of years.

In 1870 he was in London, whence he went to Siberia to rescue Tchernischevsky. It was the first attempt of its kind, subsequently followed by that of Mishkin and others. He thought that Tchernischevsky would be in position to gather around himself all the revolutionary forces in Russia. Having been discovered before he accomplished his task, he was arrested, but escaped. Soon afterward we find him in Zürich, assisting Peter Lavroff in the publication of the famous revolutionary magazine, *Forward*. In 1883 he assisted in the publication of the *Messenger of the People's Will*, published in Paris. His last effort was to re-organize the *Narodnaia Volia*, which had

been crippled by the persecution of the government, most of its members having been either hanged or imprisoned. In a short time he established about three hundred circles and organizations. In 1884 he was recognized by an agent of the secret police in St. Petersburg, and after a fierce struggle, he was overpowered. After a preliminary imprisonment for three years he was tried jointly with others, the celebrated poet Melshin Jacobovitch among them, in June, 1887. The gendarmes made an effort to hang him. They accused him of organizing the assassination of Colonel of Gendarmes Sudeikin, but the Military Court, before which he was tried, rejected this accusation. In fact Lopatin opposed terrorism for a number of years and began to advocate it only on his last journey to Russia. He was, however, sentenced to death as a dangerous revolutionist, and his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in Schlüsselburg. Altogether he has been arrested twenty-six times, and he has crossed the threshold of seventeen prisons. This martyr, who is now sixty-one years old, has served his cause for forty years, twenty-five of which have been spent in jails.

Such is the brief story of the Bastille. We have omitted many of its shocking details. They are beyond the imagination of those who have not lived through them. Let us hope that the Russian revolution, unhampered by renewed oppression, will ultimately triumph over Czarism and make the repetition of such a story impossible forever.

SIMON O. POLLOCK.

Socialism and Religion.

I.

IF we try to find a key for the mutual relation of socialism and religion in the practical attitude of socialist speakers and writers and religious spokesmen, we are easily led to believe, that the greatest misunderstanding, confusion, and internal contradictions reign in this regard. On one side we see that numerous laborers, when joining the ranks of the socialists, also throw their theological faith overboard and often combat religion fiercely; moreover, the teachings, which form the basis and strength of present-day socialism, and which together form an entirely new world conception, stand irreconcilably opposed to religious faith. On the other hand, we see faithful adherents of Christianity, even priests, demanding socialism precisely on account of their Christian teachings and gathering under the banner of the labor movement. And all agitators, and, what is still more significant, all programs of international socialist parties, unanimously declare religion to be a private affair of individuals, in which others have no business to interfere. Nevertheless most priests and official representatives of religion combat the social democracy very zealously. They contend, that this movement aims merely to exterminate faith, and they harp unctuously upon all statements of our great champions Marx, Engels, Dietzgen, in which they make critical remarks about religion and defend their own materialism as a scientific doctrine. This, again, is opposed by comrades in our own ranks, who, relying upon the declaration of neutrality toward religion in our party program, would prefer to forbid the spreading of such statements, which hurt the feelings of religious people. They say that the goal of our socialist movement is purely economic. In that respect they are right, and we shall not fail to repeat this again and again in refutation of the lies of the preachers. We do not wish to inoculate people with a new faith, or an atheism, but we rather wish to bring about an economic transformation of society. We desire to displace capitalist production by a socialist one. Any one may realize the practicability of such a collective production and its advantages over capitalist exploitation, for reasons which have nothing at all to do with religion. To this end we want to secure the political power for the working class, since it is indispensable as a means to this end. The necessity, or at least the desirability, of this transfer of the po-

litical power can be understood by any laborer from his political experience, without any further ceremony, regardless of whether he is in matters of faith a Protestant, a Catholic, a Jew, or a Freethinker without any religion. Our propaganda, then, is to be exclusively devoted to the work of elucidating the economic advantages of socialism, and everything is to be eschewed, which might run counter to the prejudice of religious minds.

Evident as this conception may be, at least in its first part, yet it has its drawback, and there will be few, who will agree with the ultimate conclusion. If it were correct, and if it were our aim to preach the beauties of socialism to all people, then we should naturally have to address ourselves to all classes of society, and first of all to the most educated. But the history of socialism has thoroughly disavowed the utopian sentimentalists, who wanted to do this. It was found, that the possessing classes did not care about these advantages, and that only the working class became more and more accessible to this understanding. This in itself indicates, that something more has to be considered than merely to prove to people the practicability of an economic transformation of society. This transformation, and its instrument, the conquest of the political powers by the working class, can only be the outcome of a great class-struggle. But in order to carry this class-struggle successfully to its conclusion, it is necessary to organize the whole working class, to awaken its political intelligence, to endow it with a thorough understanding of the internal forces which move the world. It is furthermore necessary to be familiar with the strength and weakness of the opponents of the working class, in order to make the best use of them, and in order to be able to meet all influences energetically, which might weaken the internal and external strength of the organized army of workers. Only a clear grasp of all political and social phenomena can preserve the present leaders and members of the socialist movement from missteps and mistakes, which might seriously injure the propaganda among the still unenlightened masses. Only profound knowledge will enable them to wrest ever new concessions from their enemies by their tactics and to benefit the working class.

If it is a fact, that the greatest amount of knowledge and understanding is required in our ranks for the purpose of waging our fight well, and if the materialistic writings of our master minds tend to increase this intelligence, then it would involve great disadvantages to try to conceal and suppress these writings and conceptions for no other reason than that of avoiding a clash with the prejudices of people of limited knowledge.

Our theory, the socialist science founded by Marx and Engels, was the first to give us clear glimpses of the different social interrelations, which influence our movement. It will, therefore,

be necessary for us, to turn to this science for a satisfactory answer to the question of the relation between socialism and religion.

II.

If we wish to decide upon our attitude toward religion, it will first be necessary for our science to enlighten us concerning the origin, the nature, and the future of religion, and this enlightenment, like every science, must be based upon experience and facts. Now we find in all countries with a strongly developed socialist movement, that the mass of the class-conscious workers are without religion, that is, they do not believe in any religious doctrines and do not adhere to any of them. This seems at first sight all the more peculiar, as this mass has generally received but little schooling. On the other hand, the "educated" classes, that is, the bourgeoisie, return more and more to faith, although there was at one time a strong anti-religious movement among them. It seems, then, that belief or unbelief are not primarily a result of culture, of a certain degree of knowledge and enlightenment. The socialist workers are the first among whom irreligion appears as a social mass phenomenon. There must be some definite cause for this, and if this does not prove to be merely a transient fact, it must necessarily result in a greater and greater restriction of the field of religion by socialism.

Now the partisans of religion often contend that this is not the case, for religion, according to them, is something more and higher than a mere theological faith. The devotion to an ideal, the willingness to make sacrifices for a great cause, the faith in the final victory of the Good — all this is said to be also religion. In this sense the socialist movement must even be called deeply religious. Of course, we are not going to split hairs about words. We will merely say, therefore, that this meaning of the term religion is not the customary one. We know very well that the socialist working people are filled with a great and high idealism, but with them this is not allied to a belief in any supernatural power, which is supposed to rule the world and guide the fates of men. We use the term religion only in this last meaning, that is, as a belief in a god.

Now let us ask ourselves whence this faith comes, and what it signifies. It is obvious, that the faith in a supernatural power, which rules men and the world, can exist only to the extent that the actual forces controlling the processes in nature and in the human world are unknown. A Kaffir, who serves as porter in a South African railway station and who suddenly hears the Morse apparatus starting in to give signals, believes that a god is concealed in it. He bows deeply before the apparatus and says reverently: "I will at once inform the boss" (the telegraph

operator). This conception of the untutored man is quite intelligible, and so is the fact that the primitive people believed the nature around them to be filled with all sorts of mysterious spirits. In their economy they depend wholly upon nature. Many natural forces and unknown powers threaten their lives and their work, while others are favorable, useful, benefiting to them. They have no means of knowing and controlling those powers. These appear to them as supernatural, manlike, forces with independent wills, and they seek to influence them with the means of their limited mental horizon, with prayers, sacrifices, or, perhaps, threats. The little general knowledge required for their economy is intimately connected with their religious conceptions. The priests owe their great influence precisely to the fact, that they are the bearers of the knowledge transmitted by tradition, so that they are the mental directors of production. Just as in their conception of the forces of nature elementary and crude empirical knowledge is mixed with fantastic superstition, so their religious ceremonies form a mixture of actions necessary in production and of actions wholly superstitious and useless.

Civilized people are no longer influenced so overwhelmingly by the forces of nature. Although it would not do to say, that they are scientifically understood in the beginning of civilization, yet men are more out of reach of their direct influence. Their methods of production and of labor have become so developed, that men feel more independent of natural events and are not so helpless against them as savages. When we come to a later stage of civilization, to the age of capitalism, then we meet with a rapidly developing natural science, which investigates the forces and effects of nature systematically and uncovers their secrets. By the application of this science in technique, the forces of nature are even made subject to the production of the necessities of life. For the modern civilized man, then, nature holds no more mysterious powers, which might induce him to believe in supernatural forces. These spirits of the past are tamed and pressed into his service as ordinary forces of nature, whose laws and processes are known to him.

Nevertheless we find that the class, in which this culture and this supremacy over nature are incarnated, has remained, or has again become, religious for the greater part, with the exception of a strong temporary current, of bourgeois materialism in the nineteenth century. Why is that so? What reason have they for assuming the existence of a supernatural ruler of the fates of mankind? In other words, what forces are there that still strongly affect the existence of the bourgeoisie, and that are still unknown in their origin and nature and therefore may still be regarded by them as mysterious and supernatural forces? These

forces are derived from the social order. The adage says, indeed, that every one is the captain of his own soul, but in practice most of the capitalists find out that this is not true.

As an independent producer, the capitalist may do his best, he may attend conscientiously and thriftily to his business, he may exploit his employes thoroughly without any sentimentality, he may keep his own expenditures within a decent limit, and nevertheless prices may fall, until he has to sell almost without any profit, or even at a loss, and in spite of his efforts the evil monster of failure creeps upon him. Or, his business may be going well, and he may be accumulating money at a fine rate, when all of a sudden a crisis overtakes him and swallows his whole business. How does this happen? He does not know. He lacks the knowledge of political economy, which might enlighten him about the fact, that capitalism necessarily must produce such great social forces, which may lift the individual to high prosperity, if he is lucky, but which may also destroy him. The origin of these forces is to be sought in the fact that production is indeed social, but only in the form and appearance of production depending on private enterprise and control. The individual fancies that he is working independently, but he must exchange his products with others, and the conditions of exchange, the prices, and the possibility of exchanging at all, are decided by the totality of social conditions. Production is not consciously regulated by society. Its social character stands above the will of mankind, the same as the forces of nature, and for this reason social laws face the individual with the inevitability and cruel inexorableness of natural forces. The laws of this artificial nature, of this process of production, are unknown to him, and for this reason he stands before them just as the savage stands before the laws of nature. They bring destruction and misery in many forms, occasionally also fortune. They rule his fate capriciously, but he does not know and understand them.

The socialist proletariat stands before these forces with a different attitude. It is precisely its oppressed condition which deprives it of all interest in the preservation of capitalism and in the concealment of the truth about this system. Thus the proletarian is enabled to study capitalism well, he is compelled to make himself thoroughly familiar with his enemy. This is the reason why the scientific analysis of capitalism given in "Capital," which is the life's work of Karl Marx, met reluctance and little understanding on the side of the bourgeois scientists, but was hailed with enthusiastic appreciation by the proletariat. The proletarians find in this work a revelation of the causes of their poverty. By its teaching they are enabled to understand the whole history of the capitalist mode of production. They become aware of the reasons, why it must inevitably be the fate of innumerable small

bourgeois to fail, why hunger, war, and the suffering incidental to crises must necessarily follow from this production. But they also see, in what manner capitalism must ruin itself by its own laws. The working class understand, why by their insight and knowledge, they will be enabled to displace capitalism by a consciously regulated social production, in which no mysterious forces can any longer bring destruction to mankind. The socialist portion of the working class, then, stands before the social forces just as intelligently and understandingly as the educated bourgeois stands before the forces of nature.

Here, then, lies the cause of the irreligion of the modern class-conscious socialist proletariat. It is not the product of any intentional anti-religious propaganda. Nor is it the demand of any program. It comes rather gradually as a consequence of the deeper social insight, which the working people acquire by instruction on the field of political economy. The proletarian is not divorced from his faith by any materialist doctrines, but by teaching which enables him to see clearly and rationally through the conditions of society, and to the extent that he grasps the fact that social forces are natural effects of known causes, the old faith in miracles dies out in him.

III.

In order to understand the nature of religion thoroughly — and only a thorough understanding will enable us to grasp its effects in present society — we must come to a clear conception of the nature of spiritual things in general. It is in this respect that the philosophical writings of Josef Dietzgen are so valuable, because they give us clearness about the nature of the mind, of human thoughts, theories, doctrines, about ideas in general. Only in this way do we fully realize our role in social life and in the present struggle. Whatever is in the mind, is a reflection of the world outside of us. It has arisen out of this world. Our conception of things true and real is derived from our experience in the world, our conception of things good and holy from our needs. But these mental reflections are not mere mirrored pictures, which reproduce the object exactly as it is, while the mind plays a purely passive role. No, the mind transforms everything, which it assimilates. Out of the impressions and feelings, by which the material world exerts an influence upon it, it makes mental conceptions and assumptions. Dietzgen has explained, that the difference between world and mind, original and copy, is this, that the infinitely varied, concrete, ever changing flow of phenomena, of which reality consists, is turned by the mind into abstract, fixed, unchangeable, rigid conceptions. In these conceptions the general, lasting, important,

salient facts are detached from the multicolored picture of phenomena and designated as the nature of things. In the same way we spiritualize among the many things and institutions necessary for our welfare those by the terms good, moral, holy, which are essential for the satisfaction of our lasting, vital and general requirements.

It is inherent in this nature of mental concepts and assumptions, that although they are derived from reality, yet they cannot immediately follow reality in its ceaseless alterations. When a thing has once been gathered from experience as a mental copy, it becomes fixed in the mind and remains there enthroned as a recognized truth, while new experiences are crowding upon the mind, to which this truth can no longer be reconciled. At first this truth resists, but gradually it has to submit to modification, until finally, when the new facts have been accumulated in crushing masses, it is overthrown, or thoroughly understood and altered. This is the history of all scientific theories. The place of the old is taken by a new theory, which then gives to the entire store of material facts an abstract and systematic summarisation.

We are not so much interested here in the scientific theories, as in the general conceptions concerning the nature of the world and the position of man in it, which are incorporated in the philosophies and religions. These are not theories abstracted from the experiments and special observations of learned explorers. The facts on which they are built up are rather the experiences and the feelings of whole nations or popular classes. They form their general ideas and conceptions out of their primitive observations of the world outside of them, especially out of their experience concerning their own position in nature and in social environments, particularly concerning the requirements of their life. Wherever powerful unknown forces press upon them—as we have indicated before—their conception of the world is dominated by supernatural forces, and other conceptions are joined to this fundamental thought. This was the case, until now, in almost the whole of history, with only a few exceptions. In the religious doctrines, then, we find the general primitive conceptions concerning the nature of the world and of the relations of man to those unknown forces expressed in mystified forms. Everything required for the maintenance or the interests of this class of people then assumes the form of a divine law. When all hope of improvement by self-assertion is gone, as it was among the ruined Roman proletarians of the first centuries of Christianity, then meek suffering without resistance and inert waiting for supernatural salvation become the highest virtue. But when an energetic preparation for war is required to keep hold of a conquered country and is accomplished by success, as

it was among the Jews of the Old Testament, then Jehovah helps his chosen people and those obey his laws who fight bravely. During the great class struggle in Europe, called the Reformation, every one of the classes engaged in the fight regarded as God's will whatever agreed with its class interests, for each could conceive only of those things as being absolutely good and necessary which were vital for the existence of his class. For the followers of Luther, who loved to serve a prince, God's law, or God's truth, demanded obedience to authority; for the free bourgeoisie of the towns it demanded Calvinist equality of individuals and selection by grace; for the rebellious peasants and proletarians it demanded the communist equality of all mankind. The struggling religions of that period may be compared in a general way with the political parties of the present day. The members of the same class assembled in them, and in their congresses (councils) they formulated in the shape of confessions of faith (we would say programs nowadays) their general conceptions of what they thought to be true, good, and necessary, and what was consequently God's truth and God's will. In those days religion was something living, deeply and intimately connected with the whole life, and for this reason it happened continually that people changed their religion. When a change of religion is considered merely as a sort of violation of conventionality, as it is in our day, it is an indication, that religion remains untouched by the great social movement of modern times, by the struggles which stimulate men, and becomes a mere dead husk.

With the development of society new classes and new class antagonisms have arisen. Within the previously existing communities of the faithful different classes, and antagonisms resulting from them; have grown up. From the same stratum of small bourgeois, there have arisen great capitalists and proletarians. The confession of faith, which was formerly an expression of a living social conviction in a theological garb, becomes a rigid formula. The community of faithful, formerly a community of interests, becomes a fossilized thing. The mental conceptions persist by tradition as abstract theological forms, so long as they are not shaken by the strong gale of a new class struggle.

When this new class struggle comes, it finds the old traditional antagonisms in its way, and then the fight between the traditional faith and the new reality begins. The present actual class interests are identical for the working people of different religious confessions, while a deep class antagonism exists between laborers and capitalists of the same religious denomination. But the new reality requires time to overcome the old traditions. From a time, in which a religious community represented a living community of interests, the association of members of the same faith has been transmitted as a tradition, and a sacred tradition of

that. Because this association is the mental image of a former reality, it still persists as a spiritual fact and attempts to maintain itself against the onrush of the new facts, which influence the mind of the laborer by his own experience and by socialist propaganda. In the end the old group of conceptions and interests, which has become a dead husk, must yield to the new group based on present class interests.

Religion is, therefore, only temporarily an obstacle for the advance of socialism. By virtue of the sacredness attached to its doctrines and commands it can maintain itself longer and more tenaciously than other bourgeois conceptions, and this tenaciousness has sometimes created the impression that the faithfulness of the religious laborers would be a bar to practical and a refutation of theoretical socialism. But in the long run even this ideology succumbs to the power of reality, as the Catholic laborers in Germany have proved.

IV.

The socialist teachings have inoculated the laboring class with an entirely new conception of the world. The realization, that society is in a process of continual transformation, and that misery, poverty, exploitation, and all the suffering of the present are only temporary and will soon yield to an order of society, to be inaugurated by his class, in which peace, abundance, and fraternity shall reign, this realization must revolutionize the whole world conception of the laborer from the ground up. The theory of socialism furnishes the scientific foundation for this world conception. Political economy teaches us to understand the internal laws, which move the capitalist process, while historical materialism lays bare the effects of the economic revolution upon the conceptions and actions of people. And this stands irreconcilably opposed, as a materialistic doctrine, to religion. The socialist laborer who has recognized his class interests and has thereby been inspired with enthusiasm for the great aim of his class struggle, will then naturally desire to get a clear understanding of the scientific foundations of his practical actions. To this end he is acquainted with the materialistic doctrines of socialism. But it is not merely on account of the satisfaction derived from a thorough understanding, that it is necessary for the socialist parties to promote a thorough understanding of these teachings among their members. It is necessary rather because such an understanding is indispensable for a vigorous pushing of our fight.

The actual state of affairs, then, is just the opposite of what the theologians believe and proclaim. Our materialistic doctrines do not serve to deprive the laborers of their religion. They ap-

proach our doctrines only after their religion is already gone, and they come to us for a more profound and uniform substantiation of their views. Religion does not flee, because we propagate the doctrines of materialism, but because it is undermined by the simple new gleanings on the field of economics, gathered by a careful observation of the present world.

In declaring that religion is a private matter, we do not mean to say that it is immaterial to us, what general conceptions our members hold. We prefer a thorough scientific understanding to an unscientific religious faith. But we are convinced, that the new conditions will of themselves alter the religious conceptions, and that religious or anti-religious propaganda is unable to accomplish or prevent this.

Here lies the crux of the difference between our conception and all former ones, between the present proletarian movement and former class movements. Our materialistic theory has uncovered for us the actual foundations of former historical struggles. It has demonstrated, that it was always a question of class-struggles and class interests whose goal was the transformation of economic conditions. Men were not clearly aware of the material reasons for their struggles. Their conceptions and aims were disguised by a mystic cover of eternal truths and holy infinite aims. Their struggles were therefore carried on as struggles between ideas, as struggles for divine truth in fulfillment of God's will. The struggles assumed the shape of religious wars. Later, when religion no longer occupied first place, when the bourgeoisie, fancying that they could grasp the whole world by reason, fought against the representatives of the church and nobility, then this bourgeoisie imagined that they were waging a fight for the ultimate rational, for eternal justice based upon reason. At that period the bourgeoisie championed materialism. But as yet they understood but little of the real nature of the struggle, and carried it on in that juristic mystification, here and there as a struggle against religion. They did not see, that this fight was nothing but a class struggle of the bourgeoisie against the feudal classes, and had for its aim only the installation of the capitalist mode of production.

In this respect our class struggle is different from all previous ones, for by virtue of our materialist science we recognize it to be exactly what it is, namely a struggle for the economic transformation of society. Although we feel the high importance of this struggle, and often express it in our writings, that it shall bring freedom and brotherhood to mankind, realize the Christian ideals of human love, and emancipate human thought from the oppression of superstition, nevertheless we do not represent this struggle as an ethical one for a moral ideal, as a juristic one for absolute liberty and justice, or as a spiritual one

against superstition. For we know, that it is waged in reality for the revolution of the mode of production, for the requirements of production, and all other things are but results flowing from this basis.

This clear grasp of the real nature of our struggle is expressed in the declaration that religion is a private matter. There is no contradiction between our materialist doctrine and this practical demand. They do not represent two antagonistic points of view, which must be reconciled, in the way that "considerations of practicability" must be reconciled with "soundness of theoretical principle." No, just as our so-called considerations of practicability are everywhere results of a clearly understood theory, so it is here, as the above statements show. The declaration that religion is a private matter is therefore an expression of the clearly scientific nature and aim of our struggle, a necessary consequence of our materialist theory of history, and only our materialism is able to give a scientific vindication of this demand.

ANTON PANNEKOEK.

Translated by Ernest Untermann.

William, the Faithful.

Mrs. Pitzer was a widow with seven children, who lived in Lucasville, Ohio. She had Heart Trouble, so it was up to her eldest sons, William and Wallace, to hump for the Family Flock.

William was steady and industrious. He kept the books and handled the cash for the Wind Mill Factory at ten dollars a week. Whenever the rent man or the grocer came around, William always was there with the goods.

He spent his evenings steering the little Pitzers through the shoals of Long Division and the intricacies of the Multiplication Table, and whenever he got a half day off he put on his overalls and cut the grass or split kindling for the kitchen stove.

No matter when the call came, he was never asleep at the switch.

Wallace was different. He liked to loaf around the stores and chew tobacco and crack coarse jokes. He stood to win with all the Rough Necks in the county, and Sat Down cheerfully on William like a Wet Sponge.

The neighbors said he was too lazy to take off his clothes when he went to bed and the members of the First Church felt so sorry for Mrs. Pitzer that they thought of Wallace during Protracted Meeting and gave him a special Interest in their Prayers.

One spring Wallace soured on Lucasville, so he pryed open William's bank of mortgage money and went West.

He squatted in Missouri and sent home such Cutting letters that his mother flew into hysterics every time she came across an old piece of Battle Ax.

She said if William had treated Wallace with a little more consideration, he never would have left home.

But Wallace's feet got colder every day. A nice little stream ran through his claim and there were plenty of rocks, but the breezes didn't stir up any gold dust nor did he strike oil. And he found that settlers out West hated a loafer almost as much as they did back in Ohio.

He wrote for money to go home on, but it takes a long time to save \$35.50 out of a busy salary of ten dollars a week, and he couldn't find anybody green enough to trade a return ticket for a piece of worthless farm land. So Wallace stuck.

But this is not the end of the story. In a few years a city grew up on the banks of the Kaw and Wallace's land increased in value. He sold part of his claim and put up a store and was known as a "Prominent Citizen." The next year he let go of

another square, erected a business block and became a Benefactor.

And when the Street Railway began operations and the Gas Company was organized, the people elected him mayor and he began to write magazine articles for young men on "How to Succeed."

Last year Wallace was made President of the Commercial Club and the papers still rave over his "Financial Acumen" and his "Wonderful Business Foresight."

Occasionally Lucasville is honored by a visit from its distinguished townsman, when Mrs. Pitzer is moved to chide William for his lack of enterprise. And Wallace hands out advice freely on every side.

All these years William has been doing the Faithful Fido act twelve hours a day at ten dollars a week, for the Wind Mill people. A younger man is Handling the Cash at a bigger salary. But every Christmas the manager comes around and slaps William on the back and says the House needs Faithful Men.

* * *

All of which goes to show that Virtue is still its own reward.

MARY E. MARCY.

EDITORIAL

The German Elections.

The news agencies and press of the world seem to have engaged in a gigantic conspiracy to spread the idea that German socialism had suffered an overwhelming defeat. The fact is, as most of our readers probably know, that while the representation in the Reichstag has been decreased by about twenty or twenty-three members, nearly a quarter of a million votes have been gained. The result in the Reichstag is due to several things. In the first place districts are so arranged that it takes sometimes three times as many socialist voters to elect a member of the Reichstag as any other party. Had the socialists representatives in proportion to their membership, the same as the clericals, they would have one hundred and twenty-nine members at the present time.

Again, there has undoubtedly been considerable trading among the various parties heretofore and this has always benefitted the socialists more or less so far as members of the Reichstag were concerned. At the election just passed the war cry of all parties was "Down with the Socialists!" As a consequence, neither at the first nor at the second elections were any votes given to the socialists save by those who really accepted the principles of socialism. Again a tremendous effort was made to defeat the socialists. All the powers that capitalism could command were brought into play. These were not used in a haphazard way as in previous elections. A powerful organization, known as the "Anti-Socialist Union" selected in each district the man whom it was thought had the best chance of defeating the socialists and threw all its strength in favor of the one so selected.

Strenuous efforts were made to bring out what has always been designated as the strongest of all German parties, the party of non-voters, and it was, to a large degree, recruits from this hitherto lethargic mass which carried the candidates of the Emperor to victory.

The result has been hailed in this country to some extent as a

victory for radicalism as opposed to socialism. The same papers which published this statement are now publishing a cablegram stating that Herr Barth, German Representative of what in this country would be called "Hearstism," was so completely discouraged by the election that he is preparing to come to the United States.

The fact is that this election is the logical result of drawing class lines for the first time throughout Germany. It is quite possible that a second election might see a still further decrease of socialists in the Reichstag together with a much greater increase in the vote. A complete amalgamation of all parties opposed to socialism could produce this result. Whether that amalgamation could be brought about without sending such great numbers into the socialist camp as to materially increase not only the vote but the parliamentary representation, is impossible to tell.

The exact situation at the present election is shown by the following table:

Comparison With Elections of 1903.

Parties:	Vote in 1903	Members in 1903	Vote in 1907	Members in 1907
Socialists	3,010,756	81	3,251,005	43
Center	1,876,092	100	2,274,097	108
Conservatives	914,269	74	1,124,923	81
All the other 11 parties....	3,694,645	142	4,449,743	165

Total in 1903.....9,495,762 Total, 1907...11,109,768

It will be seen that the increase in the vote is nearly equal to that which might have been expected by comparison with previous years as shown by the following table giving the vote from 1871 to the recent election:

Year	Socialist vote	Candidates elected
1871.....	113,048	2
1874.....	350,861	9
1877.....	493,258	12
1878.....	437,158	9
1881.....	311,961	12
1884.....	549,990	24
1887.....	763,128	11
1890.....	1,427,298	35
1893.....	1,780,989	44
1898.....	2,113,536	56
1903.....	3,010,756	81
1907.....	3,251,005	43

It will be noticed that there have been times of actual decrease in the vote in the succeeding years so that this was far from being the downfall of "German Socialism."

It is noteworthy that in the new Reichstag Bebel still remains the only figure that the government fears and the only one of which it is true that the announcement of his intention to speak will fill all the galleries. It is very doubtful whether Von Bulow will be able to maintain a working majority in the new Reichstag for any length of time. His first attempt will necessarily be to drive through the increased appropriation for the army and colonial expansion which were the issues of the election just passed. These appropriations will necessarily mean increased taxation and this will mean in turn, opposition.

The road of the government with its "victory" is by no means an easy one.

* * *

The following note was sent by Comrade Robert Hunter, explanatory of the "Taff Vale" matter referred to in his article in this issue:

I am convinced that some details upon the Trades Disputes' Act of the last parliamentary session will be of general interest to the readers of the Review. The passing of this bill ends the interesting incident which began with the Taff Vale decision spoken of above. A bill was introduced into the House by the Labor Party for the purpose of definitely assuring certain rights to the trade unions. Immediately, however, after the introduction of the Labor Bill, the Liberal Party or the Government introduced a similar bill. The latter bill, however, failed to deal fairly with the question of the liability of the trade unions and of their funds. There was a complicated clause in the Government Bill which made the union responsible for any act it might take as a body, but left it free of responsibility for the acts of its officials and agents. The clause did not give satisfaction to the Labor Party and they pressed their own bill which was read a second time, the Government themselves supporting it. The Act finally passed reads in this manner:

"An act done in pursuance of an agreement or combination by two or more persons shall, if done in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute, not be actionable unless the act, if done without any such agreement or combination would be actionable.

Peaceful Picketing. It shall be lawful for any one or more persons acting on their own behalf or on behalf of a trade union or of an individual employer or firm in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute to attend at or near a house or place where a person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, if they so attend merely for the purpose of peacefully obtaining or communicating information, or of peacefully persuading any person to work or abstain from working. An act done in contemplation or further-

ance of a trade dispute shall not be actionable on the ground only that it induces some other persons to break a contract of employment or that it is an interference with the trade, business or employment of some other persons, to dispose of his capital or his labor as he wills.

Prohibition of Actions of Tort against Trade Unions. "An action against a trade union, whether of workmen or masters, or against any members or officials thereof on behalf of themselves and all other members of the trade union in respect to any tortious act alleged to have been committed by or on behalf of the trade union, shall not be entertained by any court."

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

About the time that this number of the Review reaches its readers the curtain will have raised on another act in the great Western labor drama, unless the prosecution is enabled to secure a further continuance upon some pretext. It is over a year now since Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone were arrested in Denver for alleged complicity in the assassination of ex-Governor Steunenberg and secretly spirited from the state and incarcerated in Idaho without being given an opportunity to defend themselves as plainly guaranteed by the United States Constitution. The prosecution pretended that the kidnaping was resorted to in order that an early trial might be had — that if the defendants had been permitted to remain in Colorado they would have thrown every obstacle in the way of an immediate hearing of the case. Yet despite all the evidence that the prosecutors or persecutors claim to have the trial has been delayed and the miners' officials have been kept in prison, although surety in unlimited amounts has been offered to secure their release pending the calling of the case. This dilly-dallying on the part of the authorities has naturally created a suspicion that all the proof of the guilt of the prisoners in the possession of the prosecution is contained in the "confession" of Harry Orchard, a disreputable character who has boasted of having killed 26 persons during his career. It is further believed that attempts will be made to resort to other foul means to secure the conviction of the three men, and that Governor Gooding's unguarded declaration that the prisoners "will not leave Idaho alive" was based upon knowledge that he had that some additional plots were being hatched by Pinkerton McParland and his army of thugs on the ground. When Steve Adams admitted that he had been forced to father one of the "confessions," and that the evidence that he was to submit in assisting to railroad the three union officials to the gallows was a tissue of lies from beginning to end, it was like the explosion of a bomb in the camp of the conspirators. They were quite unprepared for the shock, and the revengeful manner in which they hustled Adams off to another part of the state to answer to a charge of murder is pretty conclusive evidence that Gooding, McParland and their satellites were sorely disappointed at Adams' desertion. Then came the announcement the first part of last month that valuable documents, photographs, affidavits, etc., had been destroyed by a "mysterious fire" in an iron safe in the office of the Mine Operators' Association at Cripple Creek. A little thing like a fire in an iron safe, locked and double-locked, in the very stronghold of the prosecution, should not cause extraordinary surprise when one stops to consider the brazen audacity and desperation of the con-

scienceless scoundrels at the bottom of the whole dastardly conspiracy. But the cool and contemptuous manner in which the whole band of conspirators regard the great mass of people as a pack of blamed fools has resulted in arousing the workers as no other occurrence has in the country's history. From ocean to ocean, from the lakes to the gulf, a mighty protest has gone out against the outrageous manner in which the Western miners have been treated, and demands have been made in language that cannot be misunderstood that Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone be given a square deal. Mass meetings have been held everywhere in which the facts in this case were fully explained and suitable resolutions were adopted by the hundreds and forwarded to those in authority. A number of issues have been raised that will afford splendid campaign ammunition in future political contests, while from an industrial viewpoint the Colorado-Idaho attack upon organized labor will do more than any other single occurrence in the recent years to destroy animosities in working class ranks and driving the workers closer together to protect themselves from the wolves of capitalism.

Second only in importance to the Western drama was the recent decision of Secretary Straus, of the Department of Commerce and Labor, that the immigration laws would not prohibit the importation of laborers under contract by the various states. The issue was raised when the state of South Carolina sent emissaries to Europe to advertise for and hire laboring people. About 500 were employed in this manner and shipped to Charleston. Their admission was protested and the case was taken up to Secretary Straus, who delivered himself of an exhaustive opinion of some twenty thousand words in which he raised the old states' rights cry and took sides with the Bourbons in their contention that the state governments were not amenable to the contract labor laws. The emigrants were permitted to disembark and accept the jobs for which they had been engaged. South Carolina is reported to have a number of commissioners in Europe whose duty it is to hire cheap labor as they may be instructed from time to time. Other states are considering the advisability of making appropriations to send missionaries to foreign lands to preach to the heathen about the beauties of American prosperity and send over as many shiploads as possible. Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri and North Carolina are named as states that will emulate the example of South Carolina. All that is required is for some capitalistic politician (elected by workingmen's votes) to introduce a bill into the Legislature to create a commission or a bunch of them to make junkets abroad to boom the "boundless opportunities of our grand and glorious state." Then along will come trains of Pullmans filled with business men whose nostrils breathe the spoils of profit from afar. They will make speeches about the flag, the opportunities for everybody to become rich and fat in a year or two in "our grand and glorious state," and champagne drinks will be the order of the day and liberal portions of graft will do the rest. Already the country is being flooded with textile operatives from the Manchester district and other parts of England as well as cheap laborers from Austria and Italy to work upon railways in the South. A dispatch announces that a number of textile workers arrived in New York from the South a few days ago and stated that they had been enticed to the United States by promises of having their wages doubled, but only to find that they were confronted by conditions that were little better than actual slavery. It is no secret that the Western capitalists want

coolie labor for their railways and mines, and the Southern capitalists are partial to cheap Europeans for their mills, mines and railways, while the trust magnates of the country in general are anxious for a larger army of unemployed in order that wages may be hammered down below the pauper level. The anti-contract labor law has been on the statute books for a score of years, and, while there have been violations in letter and spirit almost constantly, still the act has prevented the wholesale flooding of the country with laborers under bondage. If Secretary Straus' opinion is permitted to stand as a precedent, then the law is practically a dead letter and laborers by the thousands may be imported to intensify competition and become the prey of the profitmongers. Unquestionably there are academic theorists who can reason out to a nicety and their own satisfaction that it is perfectly proper to throw down the bars and have unrestricted immigration, just as the profitgrabbers are demanding. But for the most part those theorists who side with the hungry capitalists seldom come in direct competition with those who enter the mills and shops and meekly work as long hours as the bosses dictate and for twenty-five cents, fifty cents and a dollar a day less than prevailing rates in order to curry favor with their masters and hold their jobs. If these imported workers were class-conscious and fought against the oppression of capitalism, instead of working like brutes and subsisting on black bread and soup and herding together in bare rooms like cattle, there would be weight in the fine-spun argument that immigration should be unrestricted. But where these foreign importations are neither Socialists or trade unionists, ready to take their places in organizations of labor and strive for the common good, they should remain at home and fight their own battles. We have troubles enough struggling against capitalism without being handicapped by the dead weight of ignorant new-comers who are only too ready quite frequently to scab on the job.

Right in line with this cheap labor proposition that has been raised by Secretary Straus, one of Roosevelt's henchmen, we find on the other side that the Democrats, the really only genuine, dyed-in-the-wool, blown-in-the-bottle "workingman's friends" are up to their old tricks again. It takes your average Democratic politician, who weeps crocodile tears for labor until elected to office, to display his inherent hypocrisy whenever put to the test. Recently they have been performing on the labor question in Washington, and the Democrats have given excellent illustrations of their traditional mulishness, led by the pitchfork statesman, Tillman. The latter gentleman can usually talk by the hour about this being a "white man's country" and how the "niggers" should be chased off the earth. Yet when the measure came up in Congress to exclude Asiatic coolies it was the Southern Bourbons who made a fight against the proposition, probably for the reason that the Japanese, Chinese and Korean importations are not quite as black as "niggers" — and work cheaper than the latter. On the question of regulating child slavery the Democrats were also in favor of allowing the "inexorable law of supply and demand" to take its natural course, for with them "competition is the life of trade," especially when it applies to purchasing labor power, and the manner in which some of the old fossils talked about the crime of preventing the American boy from learning a trade, or how they eulogized the mill owners who utter the daily prayer, "Suffer little children to come unto me," would wring tears from a brass monkey. Their whole talk sounded as though they had

made over the speeches in defense of chattel-slavery uttered by their fathers half a century or more ago. Another measure that brought out the shameless hypocrisy of the Democratic statesmen was the Esch bill to limit to nine hours in every twenty-four the continuous service of telegraph operators and train dispatchers in towers and offices that remain open throughout the day and night. The Bourbon "workingman's friends," who never learn or forget anything, probably felt that railway employes should be compelled to work any old hours that the corporations dictated notwithstanding the horrible accidents that have occurred during the past few years because men went to sleep at their posts and were completely worn out by long hours of toil. Just why the Democratic party should always be regarded as friendly to labor is one of those mysteries that cannot be explained. The Republican party is thoroughly plutocratic and does not pretend very great friendship for the working class, but it really has done more to throw out an occasional sop than the Democratic machine, and that is not saying much. Recent history ought to demonstrate the fact clearly enough for a blind man to see that the old parties are playing a pingpong game. Whenever one of the twins pretends to favor labor the other is found to be in opposition.

There has been no important industrial disturbance during the past month. Aside from the national strikes of the bridge and structural iron workers against the bridge trust (a constituent company in the United States Steel Corporation) and the eight-hour battle of the printers, which is drawing to a close, there have been but few local struggles that attracted general attention. The second trial of President Shea, of the teamsters, upon the charge of conspiracy, resulted in acquittal and the Chicago Employers' Association is greatly disappointed. The seamen and other workers along the lakes are still sparring with various employers' associations and combines and there is considerable threatening of open shop on the one side and strike on the other when navigation opens. All of the building trades are making their annual preparations to make local demands for higher wages, shorter hours, etc., and in this branch of industry considerable fighting may be expected, if not always directed against the bosses then perhaps among some of the dual organizations. The general increase in membership among the unions has been good, and it is predicted that if business is stimulated this spring the gain will be still larger. In short, the trade unions as a whole are in much better shape than ever before, and their grasp of economic problems is surely broadening. The old cry of "keeping politics out of the union" is fast dying out, and issues, parties and candidates are being discussed with a freedom that was thought impossible a few years ago.

BOOK REVIEWS

Newer Ideals of Peace, by Jane Addams, MacMillan Co., Citizen's Library, Half Leather, 243 pages, \$1.25.

Miss Addams calls it the conflict between the old military ideal and the new industrial ideals and ethics. The socialists would say it was the conflict between the capitalist and proletarian ethics. The appeals for peace on the ground of an intuitive morality have failed and the only forces that seem to be making for peace are to be found in those connected with the industrial life of to-day and especially in what she calls its "Humanitarian Expressions."

"We care less each day for the heroism connected with warfare and destruction and constantly admire more that which pertains to labor and the nourishing of human life. The new heroism manifests itself at the present moment in the universal determination to abolish poverty and disease."

Following this idea through its various manifestations especially in city government, factory legislation, labor movements and the place of women, Miss Addams shows how at every point a new social morality is growing up, yet all social life is still confined within institutions determined in response to "military needs." Forces of social solidarity that grow out of industrial life are passed by unutilized in present institutions. This new solidarity, not yet crystallized in institutions, is expressing itself in the care for children, in the entrance of woman into civic life, which is yet on a very restricted scale. She points out how much is lost by the disregarding of woman as a political factor showing that woman's experience as the keeper of a home particularly fits her for many of the details of municipal life.

The old war virtues are passing away; the military idea of a hero is not the exclusive one, at least. The new heroism must grow out of industrialism and must make use of the forces in our society, especially the working class.

Here, as in all of Miss Addam's works, one is constantly struck with the keen insight at certain points and the apparent blindness to others closely related. She does not seem to be aware of the fact that nearly everything that she points out as to this conflict, has long ago been described under different names by socialists and that the socialist movement incorporates just this internationalism, this response to industrial life, this recognition of the necessity of woman's participation in civic life, the protection of children, the solidarity that comes from the association of producers, the uselessness and criminality of military life, and that moreover, socialists have shown the close relation of all these phases to a central systematic philosophy of society.

She refers to socialism but twice in the book; the first time to make the statement that while the socialists do constantly appeal for the extension of state action to the normal working man, they refuse, however, to deal with the present state and constantly take refuge in the formulae of a new scholasticism. "Their orators," she says, "are busily engaged in establishing two substitutes for human nature which they call 'Proletarian' and 'Capitalist.'" This bare assertion is given with no attempt at proof and apparently ignoring the broad analyses that have been made by socialists of nearly every phase of human nature which she discusses, as well as the extensive utilization of the existing state by socialists and especially she ignores the fact that the reason why a more extensive use is not made of the present state is just because of the very objection that she has so well set forth, i. e. that it is constructed in accordance with military ideals, or to speak more nearly correctly, with a class ruled state.

The other reference gives a frank recognition of the socialist internationalism. She says, "The socialists are making almost the sole attempt to preach a morality sufficiently all embracing and international to keep pace with material internationalism which has standardized the threads of screws and the size of bolts."

How closely her work is really built upon the socialist philosophy is seen by this summary of historical evolution, page 36.

"The king, attempting to control the growing power of the barons as they wrested one privilege after another from him, was obliged to use it (force) constantly; the barons later successfully established themselves in power only to be encroached upon by the growing strength and capital of the merchant class. These are now, in turn, calling upon the troops and militia for aid, as they are shorn of a pittance here and there by the rising power of the proletariat."

Socialism and Philosophy, by Antonio Labriola. Chicago: Chas. H. Kerr & Co. Cloth, 260 pp., \$1.00.

Antonio Labriola is well known to socialists in Europe and America as the author of a profound contribution to Marxian theory: "Essays on the Materialist Conception of History," "Socialism and Philosophy," measures up to the high standard set by the earlier work. It is scientific, clear-cut and free from pedantry. It expresses the best contemporary thought on the subject.

Labriola answers affirmatively the question whether there is a philosophy (*Weltanschauung*) which is the logical and necessary outcome of Marxian theory but he derides the notion of some comrades that it must be "a sort of philosophy for the exclusive use of the socialists alone." For instance, the Marxian in common with his opponents in economic theory will incorporate much of Darwinism in his philosophy. To say that socialism implies a certain philosophy does not signify that socialists have a monopoly of it. Nor does it signify that these philosophical tenets are part of socialism. Socialism is an economic theory: you cannot bring the vibration of ether within its scope.

Now as to what particular philosophy Labriola considers the necessary outcome of Marxian theory. Here are his own words: The philosophy which historical materialism implies, is the tendency toward monism. And I lay special stress upon the word tendency. I say tendency, and let me add, a formal and critical tendency. With us it is not a question of relying on an intuitive theosophical or meta-

physical knowledge of the universe, on the assumption that we have arrived without further ceremony at a comprehensive view of the basic substance of all phenomena and processes by an act of transcendental cognition." (P. 84.) "A formal and critical tendency toward monism on the one side, an expert ability to keep a level head in special research, on the other, that is the outcome. If a man swerves but a little from this line, he either falls back into simple empiricism (without philosophy) or he rises to the transcendental field of hyper-philosophy with its pretense that a man can grasp the whole world-process by mere intellectual intuition." (P. 86.)

The above quotation also shows the author's detestation of systematic philosophy with its finished diagrams of the universe. Labriola conceives philosophy as itself a process of becoming. It is ever incomplete, fragmentary and cannot be otherwise since all we know we learn by "the prosaic process of observation and experience in the different fields of reality." Our author declines to follow the example of the Hegelians whose patch-work philosophy Heine laughed at: With their night-caps they would stop the holes in the universe."

There is much unclear thought among American socialists regarding the relation between socialism and philosophy, and Labriola's work should help clarify it. We hope the book will be widely read.

Lily Steichen.

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by John B. Askew. Charles H. Kerr & Co., Cloth, 206 pp., 50 cents.

Without a doubt the foremost Marxist of today is Karl Kautsky, the editor of the *Neue Zeit*, the German Socialist scientific weekly. This book is the result of a series of articles in the Berlin "*Vorwaerts*," at the time of the discussion over the editorial policy of that paper.

The plan of the book is one which is familiar to all students of the comparative historical method. The first chapter on "Ancient and Christian Ethics" deals mainly with the Grecian philosophers. From here the author leaps at once to the "Ethics of the Period of the Enlightenment," when ethics took a secondary place to natural science, in which the rising bourgeoisie saw the philosopher's stone that was to transform the existing "vale of tears into a paradise in which man could follow his own inclinations." When the capitalist class had begun to gain power it entered upon a period of something like reaction, in which the transcendentalism of Kant gained the ascendancy over the former materialism. Nevertheless it was to a large extent Kant that laid the foundation of a real scientific materialism. The next step in the evolution was the coming of Darwin and his revolutionary discovery of the principle of biologic evolution. Here we have the introduction of the ideas of the "struggle for existence," the "survival of the fittest," adaptation and adjustment, and all the laws discovered in the biologic world transferred to ethics. Here too was introduced that idea of the universality of law throughout the animal kingdom, which did much to do away with the old idea of a supernatural ethic confined exclusively to man.

The ground was now cleared for the Marxian ethics, which explained and utilized all that had gone before. Marx and Engels had at their disposal the discoveries of natural science, the "moralized" Political Economy, and the results of statistical inquiry, together with the principles of the newly discovered laws of evolu-

tion. Indeed Marx had already applied many of these laws to society before the appearance of Darwin's epoch-making work, and should be reckoned equally with the latter as one of the discoverers of the principle of evolution.

"With all these advances and discoveries," says Kautsky, "which certainly often enough were only piece-meal and by no means quite clear by the time of the forties in the nineteenth century, all the essential elements of the materialist conception of history had been supplied. They only waited for the master who should bring them under control and unify them. That was done by Marx and Engels.

"Only to deep thinkers such as they were was an achievement of that nature possible, in so far that was their personal work. But no Engels, no Marx, could have achieved it in the 18th century, before all the new sciences had produced a sufficient mass of new results. On the other hand a man of the genius of a Kant or a Helvetius could also have discovered the materialist conception of history if at their time the requisite scientific conditions had not been too hard. Finally, however, even Marx and Engels, despite their genius and despite the preparatory work, which the new sciences had achieved, would not have been able, even in the time of the forties in the 19th century, to discover it, if they had not stood on the standpoint of the proletariat, and were thus socialists."

Building then on the base of industrial society, the questions of ethics are questions to be decided according to the industrial epoch concerned. The various systems of ethics which have arisen at various stages of industrial progress are discussed, and their relation to present conditions considered.

Gradually we see the evolution of a new ethic, based upon proletarian interests. This ethic, although born from a class, is international in its scope and works towards the abolition of classes. It requires no external class rule, no supernatural sanction for its maintenance. Its moral ideal is not based on ruling class interests, of the necessity of maintaining a servile class, neither is it ascribed to some revelation external to man, but it is drawn from a study of facts and rests upon knowledge and an intelligent pursuance of human interests.

"Where is there a moral ideal which opens such splendid vistas?" the author asks in conclusion. "And yet they are won from sober economic considerations and not from intoxication through the moral ideals of freedom, equality and fraternity, justice, humanity!

"And these outlooks are no mere expectations of conditions which only ought to come, which we simply wish and will, but outlooks at conditions which must come, which are necessary. Certainly not necessary in the fatalist sense, that a higher power will present them to us of itself, but necessary, unavoidable in the sense that the inventors improve technic, and the capitalists in their desire for profit revolutionize the whole economic life, as it is also inevitable that the workers aim for shorter hours of labor and higher wages, that they organize themselves, that they fight the capitalist class and its state, as it is inevitable that they aim for the conquest of political power and the overthrow of capitalist rule. Socialism is inevitable because the class struggle and the victory of the proletariat is inevitable."

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

TEN DOLLARS WORTH OF BOOKS FREE WITH A SHARE
OF STOCK.

Last month's Review gives full details regarding the publication of a large number of new and important socialist books which have just been published or will be published within the next few weeks. It also tells of our purchasing the plates and copyrights of nearly all the books formerly issued by the Standard Publishing Co., of Terre Haute, Ind.

These new publications and this purchase of plates involve an immediate outlay of between three and four thousand dollars in return for which we do not get books ready for sale but simply the plates from which books are to be printed in future. Nearly all our sales are made to stockholders at a discount of one half from advertised prices and therefore, although our daily sales are increasing at an encouraging rate, we cannot depend on these to provide the capital for this new investment.

We can, if necessary, borrow the money but we prefer not to burden the publishing house with heavy interest charges because we wish every purchaser of books or of stock to understand that his money will be used directly in the circulation of socialist literature and not for paying interest to capitalists.

We are constantly receiving new subscriptions for stock, but the money which came in from this source during February was only \$219.50, a small amount compared with our book sales of \$1537.61. During March and April it is essential that we sell at least 200 shares of stock at \$10 each, and we are going to make a far more favorable offer than ever before, in order to bring in the stock subscriptions without delay.

Here is the offer: Send ten dollars to reach us on or before the last day of April, and we will send by express (not prepaid unless a dollar extra is sent) a hundred and four socialist books in paper covers, amounting to ten dollars at retail prices. This offer includes the 101 books in our regular order list, amounting to \$9.60 at retail prices, and also Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Na-

poleon (25c), Deville's *Socialism, Revolution and Internationalism* (10c) and Herron's *From Revolution to Revolution* (5c.) We can not take space here to publish the entire list of 104 books, but it includes nearly all the important socialist pamphlets that are to be had in the English language.

We can not include any cloth bound books on this offer; our purchase from the Standard Publishing Company gives us an excessive stock of pamphlets, which we must close out, while our stock of cloth bound books is salable and must be replaced as soon as sold. What we need at this time is to raise additional capital without incurring new expenses.

The share of stock included in this special offer carries with it the privilege of buying our books, cloth as well as paper, at a discount of one-half, and in most cases there will be a large saving on expressage by ordering as many cloth books as possible to go in the same shipment with the set of paper covered books.

Those who are already stockholders and want the set of books can have them while they last for two dollars, expressage if prepaid by us, a dollar extra. Some of the pamphlets will not be reprinted when our present supply is exhausted, but in that case we will substitute others equally good for any that may be missing.

BOOKS JUST PUBLISHED.

Morgan's Ancient Society. All advance orders for this great book will have been filled by the time the *March Review* is in the hands of its readers, and we are confident that every purchaser will be so well pleased as readily to forgive the unavoidable delay in publication. No other work except Marx's *Capital* is so revolutionary and far-reaching in its influence on modern thought in social science. It is not in the least a controversial book: it is on the other hand a clear statement of a profound discovery,—that a society based on property and privilege, in which a few live in luxury without working, while the many work in misery without a chance to live, is not eternal but a passing thing. The conclusions drawn by Morgan are already familiar to many of our readers, since they are admirably summarized in the little book by Frederick Engels entitled "*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.*" But these conclusions are so startling to the average well-fed citizen that a good deal of proof is necessary before any impression can be made on his mind. Morgan's **Ancient Society** gives the proof. Let any reader of fair intelligence give this book a careful study, and it will be henceforth as impossible for him to believe that the poor have been always with us as to believe that the world was made out of nothing in six days.

Mechanically, the book is tasteful and attractive. It contains 586 pages, the same size as the volumes of the *International Library*

of Social Science, while the color of cloth and the stamping are uniform with our editions of "Capital" and of "The Ancient Lowly." The price has been fixed at \$1.50, subject to our usual discounts to stockholders. And for a few weeks **we will mail "Ancient Society" to any address for 50 cents**, provided a dollar is sent at the same time for a year's subscription to the **International Socialist Review**. This offer is not limited to stockholders. We have printed a circular explaining the importance of Morgan's work and the terms of this offer, and will mail extra copies for distribution to any who will undertake to see that they are distributed where they will be read. We have also in the same shape a reprint of the article by A. M. Simons in the January Review entitled **How to Read "Capital."** How many of each shall we send you?

Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History. This latest work by Karl Kautsky, an editorial notice of which appears on another page of the Review, was published last month. It is one of the most important books of the year, and no socialist can afford to miss it. Cloth, 50 cents.

The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte. By Karl Marx. Translated by Daniel DeLeon. This is one of the most important of Marx's historical works. The American edition was first issued in New York some ten years ago, by the International Library Publishing Company. The plates and copyright were transferred on May 31, 1901, to the Standard Publishing Co. of Indiana, and are included in our recent purchase. The book has never yet been adequately advertised among American socialists, and it should have a rapid sale. The retail price is 25 cents. It should be noted that our discounts to stockholders are now the same on books in paper covers as on books in cloth binding, that is to say forty per cent when we prepay postage or expressage, otherwise fifty per cent. Thus this book will cost a stockholder 15 cents if we prepay postage or expressage, otherwise 12½ cents.

The Rise of the American Proletarian. This book by Austin Lewis, just published, a chapter from which appeared in the Review for February, is the most readable book on American history from the socialist view-point that has yet appeared. It does not duplicate Mr. Simons' "Class Struggles in America," but rounds out the picture on one side, showing how the proletariat has evolved into the one really essential factor in the modern life of the American people. Cloth, \$1.00.

From Revolution to Revolution. By George D. Herron. This is an address delivered some years ago in memory of the workingmen slaughtered by the defenders of "law and order" as understood by the capitalists, in the closing days of the Paris Commune of 1871. It applies the lessons of that struggle to the problems of today.

Paper, 5 cents. (Among the books lately purchased by us from the Standard Publishing Co. is **The Civil War in France**, by Karl Marx, a review of the stirring events of the Commune written at white heat two days after the massacre. It is one of the great documents of history, and every revolutionist should read it. Paper, 25 cents.)

BOOKS IN PRESS.

We still have to ask the indulgence of comrades who have sent advance orders for four important books previously announced. **The Landmarks of Scientific Socialism** (Anti-Duehring) by Frederick Engels, translated by Austin Lewis, is nearly ready for the press, but a last revision has to be made, and the book will probably be ready early in April. (\$1.00.)

The Theoretical System of Karl Marx, by Louis B. Boudin, has been delayed by the author's illness, and two chapters have still to be electrotyped. Copies will probably be ready about the middle of April. (\$1.00.)

Marxian Economics, by Ernest Untermann, has been delayed for the reason that the author's time has been taken up with the final revision of the second volume of **Capital**. We now expect to publish **Marxian Economics** during the month of May. (\$1.00.)

Capital, Volume II, is all in type except the index as we go to press with this issue of the Review, and copies should be ready in April. We have made no great effort as yet to obtain advance orders, but we must now face the fact that an outlay of over a thousand dollars on this volume will be necessary shortly. If every comrade who has bought Volume I will send a cash order for Volume II the problem will be solved. Price \$2.00, to stockholders \$1.20 post-paid.

NEW ANNOUNCEMENTS.

In the third number of the first volume of the International Socialist Review, September, 1900, we published an article by Robert Rives LaMonte entitled **Science and Socialism** which met with so instant a welcome that the issue in which it appeared was exhausted within a few days, and hundreds of readers tried in vain to obtain it. A few weeks ago Comrade LaMonte offered us the manuscript of a newly-completed work entitled **The Nihilism of Socialism**, a critical study of recent tendencies in the socialist movement, strong and thought-provoking, and worthy of the careful attention of every serious student of the socialist philosophy. It was too long for a Review article and too solid reading for a propaganda pamphlet, so after discussing the situation thoroughly with Comrade LaMonte, we have decided to publish, as Volume 19 of the Standard Socialist Series (50c), a book to be entitled **Socialism Positive and Negative**.

It will contain the two papers just mentioned together with two or three shorter studies supplying the connecting links and rounding out a logically-conceived volume which will be a surprise and a stimulus to every reader who knows a little of socialism and wants to know more of it. (Incidentally it is of interest to note that a chapter in Boudin's forthcoming volume turns on a controversy started in the socialist press by the very article by LaMonte which is now after nearly seven years to be reprinted.)

The Right to be Lazy, from the French of Paul Lafargue, translated by Dr. Harriet E. Lothrop, is one of the ten cent pamphlets included in our recent purchase from the Standard Publishing Co. This is on the whole the brightest and keenest of all Lafargue's writings. Dr. Lothrop has used considerable freedom of adaptation, apparently out of regard to conventional and theological prejudices, and while the result is an exceedingly useful propaganda pamphlet, some of the deliciousness of Lafargue's inimitable style is lost. That is why Charles H. Kerr, the translator of two other books by Lafargue, has thought it worth while to make another translation. It will appear probably in June, in a fifty cent volume in the Standard Socialist Series(entitled **The Right to be Lazy and Other Studies**. The other studies will include "Socialism and the Intellectuals," "The Socialist Ideal," "The Rights of the Horse and the Rights of Man," "The Woman Question" and "The Bankruptcy of Capitalism."

THE CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST

published daily except Sunday, 28 columns, including all the important news of the day, fearlessly discussed from the point of view of the working class. Two dollars a year by mail to subscribers in the United States outside Chicago.

We do not publish the CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST, but we recommend it, and we have made an arrangement by which we give our readers the advantage of the following combination offers:

For *Two Dollars* we will send to subscribers outside Chicago the CHICAGO DAILY SOCIALIST one year and the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW one year

For *Three Dollars* we will send both periodicals for one year and will also send postpaid any book or books published by us to the amount of \$ 2.00 at retail prices.

CHAS. H. KERR & COMPANY,
(CO-OPERATIVE)

264 East Kinzie Street - - CHICAGO